DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 107 HE 035 646

AUTHOR	Knight, William E.
TITLE	Learning Communities, First Year Programs and Their Effectiveness: The Role of the IR Office. AIR 2002 Forum Paper.
PUB DATE	2002-06-00
NOTE	86p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum for the Association for Institutional Research (42nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, June 2-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Freshmen; *First Year Seminars; Formative Evaluation; Higher Education; *Institutional Research; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Bowling Green State University OH; *Learning Communities

ABSTRACT

Several learning communities and first-year programs have been developed at Bowling Green State University, a public doctoral-research intensive university in the midwest, over the last few years. Such programs include the Bowling Green Effect Mentoring Program, the Literacy Serve and Learn program, the Honors Program, the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives, the President's Leadership Academy, UNIV 100 (a voluntary two credit hour course for first-year students), and the University Program for Academic Success. An evaluation of these programs was conducted and the role of the university's office of institutional research was also explored. Logistic regression analyses were carried out to study program participation effects on retention and graduation after controlling for gender, race, and high school grade point average. Other analytic techniques were used to examine income versus expense and program participation effects on student attitudes. Learning center and first-year program directors were asked to comment on program effectiveness and participant satisfaction. It became clear during the program evaluations that local-level assessments are an important part of the process and that learning communities should be encouraged to adopt a more systematic approach to gathering feedback. It was also evident that the evaluation of such programs is of sufficient complexity to establish a partnership of the Office of Institutional Research, the program directors, and other stakeholders. The substantive conclusion of this formative assessment is that several of the learning communities and first-year programs are making significant impacts on retention, graduation, grades, and credit hours earned. It is not yet clear which of the activities of the successful programs are most responsible for their success. (Contains 60 tables and 36 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 473 107

Learning Communities, First Year Programs and Their Effectiveness: The Role of the ...t Office

William E. Knight
Director of Planning and Institutional Research
and Assistant Professor of Higher Education

Bowling Green State University

301 McFall Center
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
(419) 372-7816

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Wra

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RE 035 646

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Learning Communities, First Year Programs and Their Effectiveness: The Role of the IR Office

Many criticisms exist of contemporary American higher education. There are tales of public, employer, and legislative concern with the attention that faculty give to undergraduate learning. There has been increasing skepticism concerning the quality and utility of a liberal arts education. Similarly, there has been fear that students are not developing critical competencies such as communication, critical thinking, and a developed sense of social responsibility. Colleges and universities must respond to these criticisms at the same time that students come to us with an increasingly diverse array of experiences, preparation, and expectations (Shapiro & Levine, 1999).

Several longitudinal studies carried out in recent years and across a wide variety of institutions have highlighted problems affecting the state of undergraduate learning in the United States. Such problems include a discontinuity between K-12 schools and colleges, institutional confusion over purposes and goals, the tension between the liberal arts and professional curricula, faculty feeling split between their loyalty to their institutions vs. their disciplines and between their interests in teaching and research, and the divisions between academic and student affairs on campuses. These studies highlight the need to draw more explicit connections between the classes students take as well as between their in- and out-of-class experiences, the need to become more student-centered, the need to promote student-faculty and student-student interaction and collaborative and active learning activities, the need to improve and make explicit student engagement, high expectations, and assessment, and the need to emphasize competency over content and collaboration over competition (Astin, 1993; Boyer, 1987; Gamson & Chickering, 1987; Joint Task Force, 1998; Kellogg Commission, 1997; Kuh, Schuh, & Whitt, 1991; National Institute of Education, 1984; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Schneider & Schoenberg, 1998).

Institutions are responding by restructuring their activities in a variety of ways, one of which is the establishment of learning communities and first year programs. While not a new concept, these efforts have been experiencing a renaissance in recent years (Cross, 1988; Smith & Hunter, 1988; Shapiro & Levine, 1999). Many definitions and statements of the purposes of learning communities and first year programs exist. Learning communities involve curricular structures that link together courses to encourage deeper understanding of course material and more meaningful interactions between students and faculty and among groups of students (Gabelnick, MacGregor, Matthews, & Smith, 1990). Learning communities and first year programs may involve co-curricular experiences, common career interests, residential living experiences, and avocational interests. They are designed to help students overcome feelings of isolation common on large campuses and to encourage a sense of group identity and strengthen connections between various college experiences (Astin, 1993). The programs upon which the current study is focused share many of the characteristics noted by Shapiro & Levine (1999). They break students and faculty into smaller units than are normally found on campus. They encourage connections between curricular offerings. They help students build support networks. They provide a setting for students to understand the expectations of college life. They bring faculty together in meaningful ways to encourage learning. They help both faculty and students to focus upon learning outcomes. They provide a community-based setting for delivery of academic support programs. Finally, they offer a critical perspective for examining the first year experience.

Studies have shown that learning communities and first year programs can be effective in promoting student academic achievement, academic and social integration, involvement, satisfaction, sense of community, and persistence (Avens & Zelley, 1992; Borden & Rooney, 1998; Buckner, 1977; Hill, 1985; Lacy, 1978; Levine & Tompkins, 1996; Matthews, Smith, MacGregor, & Gabelnick, 1996; Schroeder & Hurst, 1996; Smith, 1991, 1993; Tinto, 1994; Tinto & Love, 1995; Tinto, Russo, & Kadel, 1994). It has also been suggested that non-participants in learning communities may benefit from interaction with their learning community participant peers (Inkelas, 1999). Some of the more rigorous studies include one carried out by Borden & Rooney (1998), where significant differences in grade point averages and retention between program participants and non-participants were analyzed after controlling for student background characteristics such as pre-college academic achievement, age, and ethnicity. A study sponsored by the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment (Tinto, Love, & Russo, 1993) examined the effectiveness of programs at three different institutions. Barefoot et al. (1998) summarized research conducted about the outcomes of first year seminars at 47 institutions; the most frequently studied outcomes included retention, grade point averages, credit hours attempted and completed, student satisfaction, graduation rates, student adjustment/involvement, and evaluations of specific components of the seminars. Shapiro and Levine (1999) discussed research and evaluation activities concerning learning communities across a variety of institutions; the outcomes studied included

student achievement and retention, intellectual and social development, student involvement, classroom experiences, and the effect of learning communities upon faculty and upon institutions.

Ideally, assessments of institutional programs and practices involve systematic collection of information about their activities, characteristics, and outcomes in an effort to support decision making and planning. A utilization-focused approach particularly focuses on gaining agreement between all relevant stakeholders concerning the scope and purpose(s) of the assessment or evaluation (Patton, 1997). This suggests that the stakeholders and those doing the assessment spend time discussing and agreeing upon the anticipated outcomes of learning communities and first year programs, how relevant data can most appropriately be collected and analyzed, and how the resulting information can best be used. Establishing important background information early in the assessment process would be particularly beneficial to those doing the assessment; such information might include who the stakeholders are and what concerns and perspectives they have, and the mission, strategic plan, goals, and strengths and weaknesses of the various programs (Worthen, Sanders, & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Assessment approaches should be flexible, especially at the beginning, and should probably employ multiple methods, perhaps both quantitative (e.g., retention, grade, and perceptions tracking) and qualitative (e.g., interviews, focus groups, observation). Shapiro and Levine (1999) point out that assessment of learning communities and first year programs might be well served to employ collaborative approaches between various stakeholders and those doing the assessment; examples include carrying out classroom research (Cross & Steadman, 1996) and reflexive interviews (Smith & MacGregor, 1991), and gaining feedback from external evaluators.

Unlike this ideal situation, however, establishing a means for providing information about the effectiveness of learning communities and first year programs can be much more difficult in actual practice. Assessment may not be a consideration at the time that programs are implemented. Program objectives for students may not exist, may be unclear, or may be difficult to link to actual data collection and analysis. There may be no staff or funding allocated to support assessment efforts. Administrative responsibility for various programs may be distributed across the institution. Eventually, those who direct programs and/or institutional leaders may turn to their institutional research offices for help. Such a request came to Bowling Green State University's (BGSU) institutional research office in Fall 2001. Additionally affecting the situation was the fact that some of the programs have existed for many years while other are brand new. Also, while the study was requested to have a formative rather than summative tone, this would be the first comprehensive and widely distributed assessment of learning communities at the university and the stakes surrounding the study would be high since it was perceived that resource allocation decisions would be affected by its results. After review of the literature on learning communities and first year programs and consideration of the available background information about those at BGSU, a multi-method approach to the assessment was conceived (McLaughlin, McLaughlin, & Muffo, 2001), with the following research questions developed to guide the study:

1. What are the demographic and educational characteristics of participants in learning communities and first year programs?
2. What are the retention and graduation rates, mean cumulative grade point averages, and mean student credit hours earned for program participants and how do these outcomes compare to those for non-participants?
3. What significant differences exist in retention rates, mean cumulative grade point averages, and mean student credit hours earned for participants versus non-participants after gender, race, and high school grade point average are controlled for?
4. What significant interaction effects exist between program participation and gender, race, and high school grade point average as shown in retention rates, grade point averages, and student credit hours earned?
5. What significant differences exist in the results of the BGSU New Student Transition Questionnaire for participants versus non-participants after gender, race, and high school grade point average are controlled for?
6. What significant differences exist in the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement for participants versus non-participants after gender, race, and high school grade point average are controlled for?
7. What are the results of income vs. expense analyses for the learning communities and first year programs?
8. What are the results of locally administered assessments of learning communities and first year programs?

Method

Brief Description of Learning Communities and First Year Programs at BGSU

Several learning communities and first year programs have been developed at BGSU, a public, residential, doctoral-research intensive university in the Midwest, over the last few years. While some of these efforts are clearly more intensive and closer to the definitions of learning communities provided above than are others, it was decided to carry out the same formative assessment of all of these programs with the idea that further studies may focus upon different outcomes for different programs.

The BG Effect Mentoring Program matches first year students with university faculty and staff in order to facilitate students' social and academic transitions to campus life. Within the Chapman Residential Learning Community students live and learn together through close interaction with each other and some of the university's best faculty; special programming includes study groups and seminars, regularly scheduled social activities, increased involvement with student organizations, and development of leadership skills through increased interaction with students, staff and faculty. The Health Science Residential Community is designed to provide students studying the health and natural sciences with a unique living-learning environment where faculty and staff members provide special assistance including tutoring, mentoring and advising. The Honors Program offers qualified students academically enriched classes, a residential opportunity, and a wide range of activities such as guest speakers, a service learning program, discussions led by honors faculty, informal reading groups, special programs of personal interest to students, a peer mentor program for first-year students.

The Literacy Serve and Learn program is a collaborative effort between the university and local public schools that provides service learning opportunities for students and instructional support for schools. The Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives focuses on multicultural initiatives on campus by providing educational programs, mentoring opportunities, scholarships, and training for students and staff; in addition, the Center staff provides individual support through advising, tutorial services, study skill sessions, and counseling. The President's Leadership Academy provides educationally, economically, and culturally disadvantaged students with opportunities to develop academic and leadership skills. Springboard is a graded, one-credit course aimed at assessment and development of skills in communication, analysis, problem solving, judgment, leadership, and self-assurance; through a series of hands-on individual and small group activities, first-year students with their individual coaches (recruited from among faculty, staff, students, community members, alumni, etc.) assess their strengths and development needs and create a personal development plan; this learning community is based upon assessment approaches utilized at Alverno College.

UNIV 100 is a voluntary two-credit hour course for first year students that exposes them to the resources of the university and promotes the development of intellectual, personal and social skills that will assist in future semesters at the university and beyond; theme sections of the course are also available and serve as an opportunity for new students to strengthen their connections to an academic major or interest. The University Program for Academic Success is designed to provide students with lower than average levels of pre-college academic preparation with opportunities to enroll in college courses while receiving special academic support that assists them in making a successful transition to the university environment; this support includes group and individual tutoring, extensive academic advising, and participation in a unique bridge experience.

It should be noted that not all learning communities and first year programs existed for each of the years highlighted in the assessment and that some programs that may meet the definition of learning communities, such as Greek organizations and Intercollegiate athletics, have never been included in studies such as this carried out by the Office of Institutional Research.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Procedures

Electronic lists of new full-time, first year participants in each of the learning communities and first year programs noted are shared with the Office of Institutional Research each fall semester. Student identification numbers are merged with demographic and enrollment data maintained by the office to produce profiles of program participants and to track their subsequent retention, graduation, cumulative grade point averages, and cumulative credit hours earned.

Logistic regression analyses were carried out to study program participation effects upon retention and graduation after gender, race, and high school grade point average were controlled for. Linear regression analyses were carried out to study program participation effects upon grade point averages and credit hours earned after gender, race, and high school grade point average were controlled for. Interaction terms were computed for program participation (coded 1 or 0) and gender (coded female 1 or 0), race (coded students of color 1 or 0), and high school grade point average (coded high GPA group 1 or 0); program interaction effects upon the same set of outcomes was then studied after controlling for the remaining background variables. Logistic regression is an appropriate statistical analysis technique when the goal is to measure the extent to which a set of independent variables significantly predict or explain changes in dependent variables with only two possible values (e.g., retained or not retained, graduated or not graduated). Linear multiple regression is a similarly appropriate technique when the dependent variables have continuous values (e.g., grade point average and credit hours earned). Working with interaction terms (for example, students being members of one demographic group and also participants in a given program) allows researchers to examine what Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) term conditional effects.

Factor analysis was used to support the development of scale scores from the BGSU New Student Transition Questionnaire; these then served as dependent variables for the examination of program participation effects after gender, race, and high school grade point average were controlled. For further information about the BGSU New Student Transition Questionnaire see http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/ir/studies/transition/newstudent01/coverpage.htm. Similar procedures were used for examining effects of learning community participation upon results of the National Survey of Student Engagement; for further details about BGSU's use of the National Survey of Student Engagement see http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/ir/studies/NSSE/NSSE01/coverpage.htm.

The income vs. expense analyses were carried out by comparing program expenses to estimated additional revenues gained by the university as a result of program participation. This was done for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. First, the improved retention rate of participants in programs that had clearly demonstrated significantly improved retention in earlier analyses was computed. Since population size may have prevented the increased retention rate for the Health Sciences Residential Community from rising to the level of statistical significance, that program was also included. For the Honors Program, the retention rate of participants was compared to that of students who qualified for Honors but who did not participate. For other programs, the retention rates of participants were compared to that of all students who did not participate in any of the programs. That rate was applied to the number of program participants and the result was multiplied by an estimate of $10,000 per year in tuition and state subsidy for retained students. The $10,000 per year estimate was established by the university's Office of Finance and Administration. Secondly, it addition to revenue gained by the university as a result of improved retention, it was assumed that some number of program participants each year chose to enroll at the university because of the existence of those programs, but there is no way to reliably gage this number. For demonstration purposes, the income vs. expense estimates are shown both with income gained from improved retention only as well as also with income gained from an assumed 5% additional enrollment rate resulting from program participation. The somewhat questionable reliability of the 5% additional enrollment estimate should be kept in mind as the results are considered.

In addition to these assessments carried out by the Office of Institutional Research, a request was sent to the learning community directors, asking them to share information on any participant satisfaction surveys, qualitative assessments, and other means of feedback and the results of these activities. These efforts and their results were summarized.

Results

Demographic and Educational Profiles of Program Participants

Summary profiles of the age, gender, ethnicity, college during the first semester, residency, ACT composite score, and high school grade point average of learning community and first year programs participants (as well as for students who didn't participate in any of the programs) for Fall 1997 through Fall 2001 cohorts are shown in Tables 1-5, respectively. The profiles demonstrate the diversity among backgrounds of participants.

Retention, Graduation, Grade Point Average, and Credit Hours Earned Tracking

Tables 1-5 also show enrollments and average retention rates, graduation rates, cumulative grade point averages and cumulative credit hours earned each subsequent spring and fall semester for learning community and first year programs participants. A comparison group of students who did not participate in any of the programs is also provided. The basic finding is that the retention rates are higher on average for participants in most of the programs than for students who did not participate in any of them.

Linear and Logistic Regression Analyses Controlling for Background Variables

A valid criticism of the tracking discussed above is that it does not take into account differences in participant characteristics such as gender, race, and pre-college academic achievement that may affect the outcomes studied. For programs such as Honors, for example, the appropriate point of comparison should probably be non-participating students with similar background characteristics as those of the participants. As a response, logistic and linear regression analyses were carried out for the same outcomes as noted earlier but with gender, race, and high school grade point average controlled for. The results of this set of analyses is are shown in Tables 6-17.

The programs showing statistically significant positive effects on retention across multiple cohorts and over multiple years after background variables were controlled for included the Chapman Learning Community (Chapman), the Honors Program (Honors), the Springboard Program (Springboard), and the UNIV100 course (UNIV100). Chapman students graduated within four years at a significantly higher rate as well. Those showing statistically significant positive effects on grade point averages across multiple cohorts and over multiple years after control for background variables included Chapman, Honors, Literacy Serve and Learn (LSL), Springboard, UNIV100, and the University Program for Academic Success (UPAS). Those showing statistically significant positive effects on student credit hours earned across multiple cohorts and over multiple years after control for background variables included Chapman, Honors, and LSL.

Also it should be noted that significant differences in retention rates were found between students in their second to third and third to fourth years as well as over their first years. Some significant differences in grade point averages and credit hours earned continued to be seen across later years as well, but they were found among fewer learning communities and first year programs than was the case concerning retention. The UNIV 131 course was included in these analyses only for its Fall 1997 cohort since the number of first year students in the course after that year was too small to permit the analyses to be carried out.

It is important to state that while statistical control for some potentially confounding background variables is helpful in attributing program participation to the outcomes studied, it would be inappropriate to conclude a strict cause and effect relationship. There may well be underlying motivational factors that lead to self-selection of students into these programs that could not be taken into account by the study. Finally the number of participants in the programs may have affected the results; this may have been the case with the Health Sciences Residential Community where the small number of participants may have kept the differences in retention rates and grade point averages from rising to the level of statistical significance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interaction Effects Between Program Participation and Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Another important question to be addressed in this assessment is that of which programs work best for which kinds of students. In response, interaction terms were calculated between program participation and gender, race (students of color vs. white), and high and low high school grade point average groups. The effect of interaction terms on retention, graduation, grade point averages, and credit hours earned were examined after other background variables were controlled for. These results are provided in Tables 18 through 53. They show that females may particularly benefit from participation in Chapman, Honors, LSL, the Center for Multicultural and Academic Initiatives (MAI), Springboard, UPAS, and UNIV100. Students of color may be more likely to benefit from participation in Chapman, Honors, MAI, Springboard, and UPAS. Finally, students with higher high school grade point averages appear to be more likely to benefit from participation in Honors, LSL, the President's Leadership Academy (PLA), and UNIV100. The UNIV 131 course was not included in these analyses because the number of first year students in the course was too small.

Comparisons of New Student Transition Questionnaire Results

The literature on learning communities and first year programs as well as the stated outcomes of many of the programs at BGSU suggest that student satisfaction, involvement, academic and social integration and development, sense of community and other perceptual factors are important outcomes to study when assessing the results of learning communities. With this in mind it was decided to explore significant differences among the results of two questionnaires that are regularly administered to undergraduates at the institution. Results of the BGSU New Student Transition Questionnaire were grouped into six scales and these were treated as dependent variables in a series of linear regression analyses where learning community participation was treated as a predictor variable after controlling for gender, race, and high school grade point average. The UNIV 131 course was not included in these analyses because the number of first year students in the course was too small. Reliabilities for the scales ranged from .21 (Academic Involvement scale for the Fall 2000 cohort) to .81 (Social Adjustment scale for the Fall 1999 cohort). The results (shown in Table 54) were not particularly informative since the effect sizes for program participation were very small and the percentage of variance accounted for in the scales due to program participation was very low (the highest was .08). A few significant differences were noted, particularly for BG Effect, the Health Sciences Residential Community (HSRC), Honors, LSL, Springboard, and UNIV100. Sharing of item-by-item comparative results among program directors is probably a more effective means of feedback for the survey results than is the higher level analysis shown in this report.

Comparisons of National Survey of Student Engagement 2000 and 2001 Results

In order to add further depth to the assessment of learning communities and first year programs, significant differences in the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement were also explored across participant groups after gender, race, and high school grade point average were controlled for. The UNIV 131 course was not included in these analyses because the number of first year students in the course was too small. Scales were formed from BGSU NSSE items to create the same "benchmark scores" as used by the NSSE staff, but without the procedures to normalize the data that were done by the NSSE staff (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, 2000). Reliabilities for the scales ranged from .50 (Enriching Educational Experiences scale for the Fall 1999 cohort) to .72 (Supportive Campus Environment scale for both the Fall 1999 and Fall 2000 cohorts). The results (shown in Table 55) were not as informative as was anticipated since the effect sizes for program participation were moderate at best and the percentage of variance accounted for in the scales due to program participation was low (the highest was .18). A few significant differences were noted, particularly for Honors, Chapman, and LSL. Additional over sampling with the Spring 2001 NSSE was carried out with a sample of Chapman, Honors, and President's Leadership Academy participants and item comparisons were made between program participants and non-participants; several statistically significant differences were found, almost all of which were in a direction that was positive for the programs. Again, this may be a better use of the questionnaire results for program feedback than is the higher level analysis provided in this report.

Income vs. Expense Analysis

See the procedures section of the paper for details of the methodology for this set of analyses. It was decided to carry out income vs. expense analyses for the Chapman Learning Community, the Honors Program, the Health Sciences Residential Community, the Springboard Program, and the UNIV100 course because the previous analyses were most supportive of the linkage between participation in the program and retention for these programs. Analyses were carried out by counting income gained from improved retention and also by additionally counting income gained from improved recruitment. The results (shown in Tables 56-60) revealed that the program income to expense ratios were all favorable. The ratio was 1.3 to 1 for Chapman if only income gained from improved retention is considered and 2.3 to 1 if income gained from improved recruitment is also considered. The ratio for Honors is 2.4 to 1 (retention only) or 4.3 to 1 (retention and recruitment). The HSRC ratio is 2.3 to 1 (retention only) or 4.6 to 1 (retention and recruitment). For Springboard the ratio is 2.1 to 1 (retention only) or 5.5 to 1(retention and recruitment). The ratios for UNIV100 are different depending upon whether the $50,000 used to pay instructors beginning in 2000-2001 is considered as an expense or whether it is not. The UNIV100 ratios are 5.3 to 1 (retention only with the $50,000 expense included), 17.5 to 1 (retention only without the $50,000 expense), 19.4 to 1 (retention and recruitment with the $50,000 expense), and 64 to 1 (retention and recruitment without the $50,000 expense).

Locally Administered Assessments

Chapman, Honors, LSL, Springboard, UNIV100, and UPAS all administer satisfaction/feedback surveys to their participants each semester and/or each year. The results have been used to modify activities and the feedback is favorable. Chapman and Honors also utilize student evaluations of instruction for their associated individual courses. Chapman also administered a follow-up survey to a sample of its original Fall 1997 cohort in the spring of 2001; the results revealed that seniors attributed very positive benefits for their educational and personal development to their first year participation in the program. UNIV100 carries out focus groups with currently enrolled students, course facilitators, and course completers. Chapman plans to carry out focus groups with a random sample of its participants each year in order to add further depth to its assessment efforts.

Springboard maintains an extensive database of pre- and post-assessment information concerning the personal and educational development of its students. Springboard involves a set of intensive one-on-one and small group activities, many of which include videotaping and focus groups. Meta-level assessments of the feedback provided to participants are used to also continually assess and improve the program.

UNIV100 is included in 2001-2002 First Year Initiative Benchmarking Study sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts. This consisted of participants completing a questionnaire concerning the effectiveness of the course in terms of their perception that it helped them to improve critical first year transition skills, understand various aspects of the university, and work through important issues related to student success. The survey also asked specific questions about the delivery of the course. Participants' survey results were compared with those of peer universities and implications for changes in practices resulted.

Discussion

As the Office of Institutional Research released its report of the results of this assessment, it worked to make clear that the assessment should be taken as formative and single point in time report, rather than a definitive set of findings upon which important decisions about the continuance of the programs and resource allocation should be made. It became clear in the course of the assessment that local-level assessments are a very important part of this process and that the learning communities should be urged to adopt a more systematic approach to gathering feedback through such means as participant surveys and qualitative assessments, carried out both for current participants and as a follow-up at later times. The assessment of the learning communities and first year programs is sufficiently complex that a partnership between the directors of the programs, the Office of Institutional Research, and other important stakeholders should be formed for the purpose of supporting ongoing, meaningful assessment. A learning community and first year program assessment committee was formed at BGSU during the time that this assessment was carried out in order to address these issues, although the difficulties posed by the decentralization of responsibility for learning communities and lack of learning community staff time and assessment expertise remain concerns. For its distribution of its report of this assessment, the Office of Institutional Research used a three-part distribution strategy. The results were first shared with institutional leaders as well as internal assessment experts both for providing a preview prior to widespread distribution

as well as gaining feedback about the appropriateness of methods. The results were then shared with the directors of the learning communities in order to provide them with a preview as well as to allow them to check on any possible errors of fact in the study. Finally, the report was made available to the general University community.

Despite the formative nature of this assessment and the several caveats that must be observed, the substantive conclusion of the assessment is that several of the learning communities and first year programs are making significant impacts upon retention, graduation, grades, and credit hours earned. The current evidence suggests that the Chapman Learning Community, the Honors Program, the Literacy Serve and Learn Program, the Springboard Program, the UNIV100 course, and the University Program for Academic Success are contributing most towards these outcomes at this time. A closer examination of the objectives and activities of some of these efforts may suggest some best practices that could be adopted more widely among other programs. The Chapman Learning Community, for example carries out a wide variety of activities (from teaching integrated, themed credit courses, to having associated faculty have their offices in the Chapman residence hall, to offering arts and social activities often involving field trips, to providing guest speakers, to facilitating service learning opportunities and more) in order to encourage interaction among students and between faculty and students, to break down the boundaries between classroom and co-curricular activities, to highlight linkages between classroom learning and students' other experiences, and to ease the transition between high school and college (Klein, Midden, & Krzesinski, 2000). Perhaps some of these approaches might be considered by other programs at BGSU if they are congruent with their objectives. What remains unclear at this time, however, is which of these activities are most critical to student success. It has become clear that the assessment of learning communities and first year programs is a complex affair that requires ongoing effort by a variety of stakeholders.

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college?: Four Critical Years revisited. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avens, C., & Zelley, R. (1992). QUANTA: An interdisciplinary learning community (four studies). Daytona Beach, FL: Daytona Beach Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 349 073).

Barefoot, B. O., Warnock, C. L., Dickinson, M. P., Richardson, S. E., & Roberts, M. R. (Eds.). (1998). Exploring the evidence: Reporting the outcomes of first-year seminars (Vol. 2). (Monograph Series No. 25). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Borden, V. M. H., & Rooney, P. M. (1998). Evaluating and assessing learning communities. *Metropolitan Universities, 9*(1), 73-88.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Buckner, D. R. (1977). Restructuring residence hall programming: Residence hall educators with a curriculum. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18(5), 389-392.

Cross, K. P. (1988). Why learning communities? Why now? About Campus, 3(3), 4-11.

Cross, K. P., & Steadman, M. H. (1996). Classroom research: Implementing the scholarship of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gabelnick, F., MacGregor, J., Matthews, R. S., & Smith, B. L. (Eds.). (1990). Learning communities: Creating connections among students, faculty, and disciplines. (New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gamson, Z. F., & Chickering, A. W. (1987, March). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. AAHE Bulletin, 5-10.

Hill, P. (1985). The rationale for learning communities and learning community models. (Report No. JC 890 389). Olympia, WA: Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 818).

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. (2000). The NSSE 2000 report: National benchmarks of effective practice. Bloomington, IN: Author.

Inkelas, K. (1999). A tide on which all boats rise: The effects of living-learning program participation on undergraduate outcomes at the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.

Joint Task Force on Student Learning, American Association for Higher Education, American College Personnel Association, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (1998). Powerful partnerships: A shared responsibility for learning. Washington, DC: Author.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1997). Returning to our roots: The student experience. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Klein, T., Midden, R., & Krzesinski, K. (2000). Chapman Community 2000-2001 survival guide. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.

Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J., & Associates. (1991). Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside of the classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lacy, W. B. (1978). Interpersonal relationships as mediators of structural effects: College student socialization in a traditional and an experimental university environment. Sociology of Education, 51, 201-211.

Levine, J., & Tompkins, D. (1996). Making learning communities work: Seven lessons from Temple University. *AAHE Bulletin, 39*(7), 3-7.

Matthews, R., Smith, B. L., MacGregor, J., & Gabelnick, F. (1996). Learning communities: A structure for educational coherence. Liberal Education, 82(3), 4-9.

McLaughlin, J. S., McLaughlin, G. W., & Muffo, J. A. (2001). Using qualitative and quantitative methods for complementary purposes: A case study. In R. D. Howard & K. W. Borland (Eds.), Balancing qualitative and quantitative information for effective decision support (pp. 15-44) (New Directions for Institutional Research No. 112). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Institute of Education. (1984). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education, National Institute of Education.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Schneider, C. G., & Schoenberg, R. (1998). The academy in transition: Contemporary understandings of liberal education. Washington, DC: The Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Schroeder, C. C., & Hurst, J. C. (1996). Designing learning environments that integrate curricular and cocurricular experiences. Journal of College Student Development, 37(2), 174-181.

Shapiro, N. S., & Levine, J. H. (1999). Creating learning communities: A practical guide to winning support, organizing for change, and implementing programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, B. L. (1991). Taking structure seriously: The learning community model. Liberal Education, 77(2), 42-48.

Smith, B. L. (1993). Creating learning communities. Liberal Education, 79(4), 32-39.

Smith, B. L., & Hunter, M. R. (1988). Learning communities: A paradigm for educational revitalization. Community College Review, 15(4), 45-51.

Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. (1991). Reflexive interview with learning community teaching teams: Strengthening dialogue about teaching and learning. Washington Center News, 6(1), 26-28.

Tinto, V. (1994). Learning communities, collaborative learning, and the pedagogy of educational citizenship. Chicago: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Tinto, V., & Love, A. G. (1995). Longitudinal study of learning communities at LaGuardia Community College. (Report No. JC 950 169). University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 818).

Tinto, V., Love, A. G., & Russo, P. (1993). Building learning communities for new college students: A summary of research findings of the Collaborative Learning Project. University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment.

Tinto, V., Russo, P, & Kadel, S. (1994). Constructing educational communities: Increasing retention in challenging circumstances. Community College Journal, 64, 26-30.

Worthen, B. R., Sanders, J. R., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1997). Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines. New York: Longman.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Profile of First Year Program Participants

Fall 1997

New Full-Time First Year Students

	BG Effect		Chapman Learning Community		Honors		Multicultural and Academic Initiatives		Springboard		UNIV 100		UNIV 131		Full-Time No First Year Program	
Total Enrolled Fall 1997	66		139		246		110		15		515		142		1,854	
Age (15th Day)																
Below 18	5	8%	1	1%	17	7%	5	5%	0	0%	20	4%	4	3%	90	5%
18	54	82%	125	90%	219	89%	89	81%	13	87%	435	84%	123	87%	1,565	84%
19	6	9%	13	9%	10	4%	16	15%	2	13%	55	11%	15	11%	156	8%
20+	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%	43	2%
College																
A&S	16	24%	44	32%	126	51%	36	33%	2	13%	85	17%	16	11%	553	30%
BA	8	12%	21	15%	20	8%	17	15%	3	20%	35	7%	5	4%	371	20%
EDHD	17	26%	37	27%	31	13%	21	19%	1	7%	177	34%	9	6%	405	22%
HHS	14	21%	9	6%	26	11%	10	9%	5	33%	48	9%	20	14%	176	9%
MUS	1	2%	0	0%	20	8%	3	3%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	80	4%
TECH	2	3%	6	4%	1	0%	7	6%	1	7%	6	1%	1	1%	64	3%
ACEN	8	12%	22	16%	22	9%	16	15%	3	20%	162	31%	91	64%	205	11%
Gender																
Female	45	68%	70	50%	179	73%	64	58%	9	60%	327	63%	84	59%	1,066	57%
Male	21	32%	69	50%	67	27%	46	42%	6	40%	188	37%	58	41%	788	43%
Ethnicity																
African Am	1	2%	13	9%	2	1%	44	40%	0	0%	26	5%	5	4%	28	2%
Asian Am	2	3%	1	1%	4	2%	11	10%	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%	6	0%
Hispanic	1	2%	6	4%	7	3%	51	46%	1	7%	24	5%	0	0%	12	1%
International	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	1	1%	0	0%	9	2%	1	1%	20	1%
Nat Amer/Am Ind	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	0%
White/Cauc	61	92%	115	83%	219	89%	1	1%	14	93%	7	1%	134	94%	1,727	93%
Unknown	1	2%	4	3%	9	4%	1	1%	0	0%	444	86%	2	1%	58	3%
Residency																
Ohio Res	65	98%	118	85%	220	89%	95	86%	10	67%	478	93%	136	96%	1,729	93%
Out of State	1	2%	21	15%	26	11%	15	14%	5	33%	33	6%	6	4%	117	6%
International	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	8	0%
ACT																
26-36	4	6%	12	9%	196	80%	12	11%	0	0%	32	6%	8	6%	188	10%
21-25	30	45%	55	40%	47	19%	32	29%	5	33%	194	38%	62	44%	844	46%
16-20	30	45%	65	47%	2	1%	54	49%	9	60%	271	53%	70	49%	751	41%
3-15	2	3%	7	5%	0	0%	12	11%	1	7%	10	2%	2	1%	38	2%
No ACT	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	33	2%
Average	20.53		20.54		27.69		20.08		19.87		20.39		20.71		21.28	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

High School GPA																
3.50-4.00	19	29%	14	10%	156	63%	17	15%	1	7%	56	11%	12	8%	292	16%
3.00-3.49	27	41%	29	21%	5	2%	27	25%	5	33%	144	28%	46	32%	524	28%
2.50-2.99	10	15%	46	33%	0	0%	23	21%	6	40%	186	36%	60	42%	593	32%
2.00-2.49	0	0%	17	12%	0	0%	14	13%	1	7%	32	6%	4	3%	103	6%
Less than 2.00	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	2	0%	1	1%	1	0%
No HSGPA	10	15%	33	24%	85	35%	28	25%	2	13%	95	18%	19	13%	341	18%
Average	3.31		2.94		3.82		3.01		3.11		3.00		3.01		3.08	
Enrolled																
Spring 1998	63		139		235		101		15		483		138		1,698	
Retention %	95.5%		100.0%		95.5%		91.8%		100.0%		93.8%		97.2%		91.6%	
Average Cum. GPA	2.69		2.87		3.54		2.53		3.12		2.64		2.58		2.56	
Average Cum. SCH	14		15		21		14		15		14		14		14	
Enrolled																
Fall 1998	47		122		226		82		12		407		120		1,401	
Retention %	71.2%		87.8%		91.9%		74.5%		80.0%		79.0%		84.5%		75.6%	
Average Cum. GPA	3.02		2.88		3.57		2.72		3.02		2.71		2.80		2.78	
Average Cum. SCH	31		30		38		28		31		27		29		29	
Enrolled																
Spring 1999	43		112		219		73		10		384		115		1,315	
Retention %	65.2%		80.6%		89.0%		66.4%		66.7%		74.6%		81.0%		70.9%	
Average Cum. GPA	3.02		2.79		3.59		2.78		2.99		2.73		2.79		2.8	
Average Cum. SCH	46		42		54		43		45		43		43		43	
Enrolled																
Fall 1999	44		108		213		69		10		370		112		1,252	
Retention %	66.7%		77.7%		86.6%		62.7%		66.7%		71.8%		78.9%		67.5%	
Average Cum. GPA	3.03		2.79		3.61		2.80		2.99		2.78		2.82		2.85	
Average Cum. SCH	61		57		72		59		59		58		58		58	
Enrolled																
Spring 2000	43		100		213		66		9		349		109		1,218	
Retention %	65.2%		71.9%		86.6%		60.0%		60.0%		67.8%		76.8%		65.7%	
Average Cum. GPA	3.01		2.85		3.59		2.85		3.06		2.84		2.87		2.89	
Average Cum. SCH	75		72		86		73		74		72		72		73	
Enrolled																
Fall 2000	42		97		204		63		10		340		108		1,158	
Retention %	63.6%		69.8%		82.9%		57.3%		66.7%		66.0%		76.1%		62.5%	
Average Cum. GPA	3.00		2.88		3.61		2.91		2.92		2.89		2.92		2.95	
Average Cum. SCH	91		89		103		91		85		89		87		90	
Graduated (Dec.)	0		1		21		3		0		4		1		29	
Graduated %	0.0%		0.7%		8.5%		2.7%		0.0%		0.8%		0.7%		1.6%	
Enrolled																
Spring 2001	40		97		183		60		10		327		104		1,111	
Retention %	60.6%		69.8%		74.4%		54.5%		66.7%		63.5%		73.2%		59.9%	
Average Cum. GPA	3.09		2.89		3.58		2.89		2.91		2.90		2.96		2.96	
Average Cum. SCH	108		103		115		103		100		103		102		103	
Graduated (May)	20		34		128		17		5		109		28		425	
Graduated %	30.3%		24.5%		52.0%		15.5%		33.3%		21.2%		19.7%		22.9%	
Cum. Graduated %	30.3%		25.2%		60.6%		18.2%		33.3%		21.9%		20.4%		24.5%	
August 2001																
Graduated	3		11		9		4		1		27		8		119	
Graduated %	4.5%		7.9%		3.7%		3.6%		6.7%		5.2%		5.6%		6.4%	
Cum. Graduated %	34.8%		33.1%		64.2%		21.8%		40.0%		27.2%		26.1%		30.9%	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Enrolled								
Fall 2001	17	51	49	41	6	190	64	576
Retention %	25.8%	36.7%	19.9%	37.3%	40.0%	36.9%	45.1%	31.1%
Average Cum. GPA	2.97	2.73	3.35	2.63	2.78	2.74	2.89	2.82
Average Cum. SCH	120	113	127	108	109	112	114	111
Graduated (Dec.)	6	14	21	10	1	63	26	224
Graduated %	9.1%	10.1%	8.5%	9.1%	6.7%	12.2%	18.3%	12.1%
Cum. Graduated %	43.9%	43.2%	72.8%	30.9%	46.7%	39.4%	44.4%	43.0%
Enrolled								
Spring 2002	11	37	30	32	5	130	42	357
Retention %	16.7%	26.6%	12.2%	29.1%	33.3%	25.2%	29.6%	19.3%
Average Cum. GPA	2.50	2.47	2.81	2.32	2.06	2.44	2.81	2.52
Average Cum. SCH	112	112	112	105	90	110	121	109

Office of Institutional Research, February 2002

Note: 36% of students were participants in at least one first year program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Profile of First Year Program Participants
New Full-Time First Year Students
Fall 1998

	BG Effect		Chapman Learning Community		Freshman Interest Groups		Health Sciences Residential Community		Honors		Multicultural and Academic Initiatives		President's Leadership Academy		Springboard		UNIV 100		UNIV 131		University Program for Academic Success		Full-Time No First Year Program	
Total Enrolled Fall 1998	67		98		162		80		257		183		21		284		686		15		199		1,962	
Age (15th Day)																								
Below 18	2	3%	6	6%	6	4%	5	6%	19	7%	18	10%	1	5%	10	4%	35	5%	1	7%	6	3%	99	5%
18	52	78%	78	80%	137	85%	71	89%	221	86%	149	81%	20	95%	243	86%	570	83%	12	80%	156	78%	1,627	83%
19	10	15%	13	13%	19	12%	4	5%	17	7%	12	7%	0	0%	30	11%	74	11%	2	13%	34	17%	192	10%
20+	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	2%	0	0%	1	0%	7	1%	0	0%	3	2%	44	2%
College																								
A&S	8	12%	28	29%	67	41%	10	13%	112	44%	55	30%	3	14%	47	17%	157	23%	1	7%	0	0%	475	24%
BA	3	4%	15	15%	0	0%	1	1%	29	11%	34	19%	6	29%	69	24%	9	1%	0	0%	0	0%	452	23%
EDHD	5	7%	25	26%	25	15%	10	13%	43	17%	36	20%	8	38%	49	17%	165	24%	1	7%	0	0%	433	22%
HHS	1	1%	8	8%	34	21%	53	66%	32	12%	15	8%	1	5%	11	4%	64	9%	8	53%	0	0%	169	9%
MUS	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	17	7%	8	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	83	4%
TECH	1	1%	6	6%	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%	11	6%	0	0%	1	0%	37	5%	0	0%	0	0%	86	4%
ACEN	48	72%	14	14%	36	22%	6	8%	19	7%	24	13%	3	14%	107	38%	251	37%	5	33%	199	100%	264	13%
Gender																								
Female	34	51%	49	50%	93	57%	61	76%	180	70%	103	56%	16	76%	166	58%	429	63%	11	73%	87	44%	1,134	58%
Male	33	49%	49	50%	69	43%	19	24%	77	30%	80	44%	5	24%	118	42%	257	37%	4	27%	112	56%	828	42%
Ethnicity																								
African Am	1	1%	10	10%	7	4%	9	11%	5	2%	117	64%	11	52%	19	7%	49	7%	1	7%	1	1%	31	2%
Asian Am	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	13	7%	0	0%	2	1%	2	0%	0	0%	1	1%	4	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	2	2%	5	3%	1	1%	5	2%	46	25%	3	14%	4	1%	10	1%	0	0%	0	0%	17	1%
International	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	1%
Nat Amer/Am Ind	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
White/Cauc	64	96%	82	84%	146	90%	69	86%	235	91%	3	2%	7	33%	249	88%	606	88%	13	87%	194	97%	54	3%
Unknown	2	3%	3	3%	4	2%	1	1%	11	4%	0	0%	0	0%	9	3%	16	2%	1	7%	3	2%	1,840	94%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Residency																								
Ohio Res	65	97%	87	89%	154	95%	74	93%	216	84%	151	83%	21	100%	260	92%	646	94%	14	93%	187	94%	1,814	92%
Out of State	2	3%	11	11%	7	4%	6	8%	40	16%	32	17%	0	0%	23	8%	37	5%	1	7%	12	6%	134	7%
International	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	14	1%
ACT																								
26-36	5	7%	10	10%	14	9%	13	16%	197	77%	12	7%	0	0%	22	8%	50	7%	1	7%	3	2%	261	13%
21-25	18	27%	41	42%	81	50%	35	44%	40	16%	69	38%	9	43%	128	45%	292	43%	10	67%	48	24%	885	45%
16-20	37	55%	35	36%	53	33%	25	31%	2	1%	72	39%	12	57%	110	39%	284	41%	4	27%	124	62%	646	33%
3-15	1	1%	2	2%	3	2%	3	4%	0	0%	9	5%	0	0%	4	1%	13	2%	0	0%	8	4%	16	1%
No ACT	6	9%	10	10%	11	7%	4	5%	18	7%	21	11%	0	0%	20	7%	47	7%	0	0%	16	8%	154	8%
Average	20.0		21.6		21.6		21.75		27.9		18.26		19.7		21.2		21.0		22.1		19.3		20.2	
High School GPA																								
3.50-4.00	8	12%	13	13%	18	11%	28	35%	244	95%	30	16%	4	19%	54	19%	102	15%	0	0%	0	0%	448	23%
3.00-3.49	6	9%	36	37%	75	46%	29	36%	12	5%	63	34%	8	38%	84	30%	204	30%	9	60%	1	1%	747	38%
2.50-2.99	19	28%	38	39%	49	30%	16	20%	0	0%	60	33%	5	24%	96	34%	276	40%	6	40%	61	31%	628	32%
2.00-2.49	31	46%	11	11%	18	11%	7	9%	0	0%	29	16%	2	10%	44	15%	97	14%	0	0%	130	65%	108	6%
Less than 2.00	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	3	2%	31	2%
No HSGPA	3	4%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	1	1%	2	10%	4	1%	6	1%	0	0%	4	2%	28	1%
Average	2.69		2.99		3.04		3.25		3.90		3.02		3.15		3.01		2.98		3.06		2.40		3.15	
Enrolled																								
Spring 1999	53		96		162		73		254		173		19		263		641		15		153		1,800	
Retention %	79.1%		98.0%		100.0%		91.3%		98.8%		94.5%		90.5%		92.6%		93.4%		100.0%		76.9%		91.7%	
Avg. Cum. GPA	2.28		2.88		2.43		2.72		3.55		2.40		2.76		2.72		2.65		2.82		2.34		2.61	
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	12		14		14		15		20		13		13		14		14		16		12		15	
Enrolled																								
Fall 1999	38		85		122		65		238		151		19		232		537		11		121		1,511	
Retention %	91.6%		91.6%		75.3%		81.3%		92.6%		82.5%		90.5%		81.7%		78.3%		73.3%		60.8%		77.0%	
Avg. Cum. GPA	2.64		2.80		2.60		2.94		3.60		2.55		2.67		2.73		2.73		2.93		2.40		2.79	
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	26		28		28		30		37		27		28		28		29		30		25		30	
Enrolled																								
Spring 2000	37		78		111		63		237		141		19		221		515		10		117		1,432	
Retention %	55.2%		79.6%		68.5%		78.8%		92.2%		77.0%		90.5%		77.8%		75.1%		66.7%		58.8%		73.0%	
Avg. Cum. GPA	2.61		2.73		2.69		2.96		3.60		2.64		2.63		2.73		2.76		3.00		2.33		2.83	
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	38		43		42		46		53		41		41		42		43		45		36		44	

Enrolled Fall 2000	32	71	108	60	236	129	15	200	486	10	91	1,340
Retention %	47.8%	72.4%	66.7%	75.0%	91.8%	70.5%	71.4%	70.4%	70.8%	66.7%	45.7%	68.3%
Avg. Cum. GPA	2.81	2.84	2.74	2.99	3.62	2.72	2.91	2.83	2.83	3.07	2.48	2.89
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	56	59	56	63	70	57	60	58	59	61	52	59
Enrolled Spring 2001	29	65	105	57	227	128	15	186	467	12	85	1,308
Retention %	43.3%	66.3%	64.8%	71.3%	88.3%	69.9%	71.4%	65.5%	68.1%	80.0%	42.7%	66.7%
Avg. Cum. GPA	2.84	2.89	2.78	3.01	3.61	2.76	2.91	2.87	2.87	2.89	2.51	2.91
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	69	75	70	77	85	71	73	73	73	68	64	73
Graduated (May)	0	1	0	1	11	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Percent Graduated	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.3%	4.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Enrolled Fall 2001	30	63	98	58	212	122	13	179	452	12	84	1,259
Retention %	44.8%	64.3%	60.5%	72.5%	82.5%	66.7%	61.9%	63.0%	65.9%	80.0%	42.2%	64.2%
Avg. Cum. GPA	2.85	2.89	2.85	3.04	3.57	2.74	3.00	2.94	2.93	2.96	2.56	2.96
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	84	91	88	92	100	86	92	91	90	87	79	90
Graduated (Dec.)	1	1	0	3	10	2	0	1	6	0	0	23
Percent Graduated	1.5%	1.0%	0.0%	3.8%	3.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
Cum. Pct. Grad.	1.5%	2.0%	0.0%	5.0%	8.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Enrolled Spring 2002	29	63	97	54	201	119	14	178	440	10	86	1,204
Retention %	43.3%	64.3%	59.9%	67.5%	78.2%	65.0%	66.7%	62.7%	64.1%	66.7%	43.2%	61.4%
Avg. Cum. GPA	2.79	2.90	2.88	3.05	3.55	2.76	3.04	2.95	2.94	2.97	2.57	2.99
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	97	105	102	107	114	99	105	105	104	106	91	104

Office of Institutional Research, February 2002

Note: 45% of students were participants in at least one first year program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Profile of First Year Program Participants
Fall 1999
New Full-Time First Year Students

	Art FIGs		BG Effect		Chapman Learning Community		Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs)		Health Sciences Residential Community		Honors		Literacy Serve and Learn		Multicultural and Academic Initiatives		President's Leadership Academy		Springboard		UNIV 100		UNIV 131		University Program for Academic Success		Full-Time No First Year Program	
Total Enrolled Fall 1999	169		41		232		147		76		229		173		219		30		280		684		16		274		1,691	
Age (15th Day)																												
Below 18	4	2%	3	7%	15	6%	2	1%	1	1%	12	5%	9	5%	24	11%	3	10%	15	5%	28	4%	1	6%	5	2%	63	4%
18	150	89%	33	80%	183	79%	126	86%	68	89%	201	88%	156	90%	176	80%	25	83%	231	83%	580	85%	15	94%	220	80%	1,407	83%
19	14	8%	3	7%	32	14%	19	13%	7	9%	15	7%	8	5%	18	8%	2	7%	30	11%	70	10%	0	0%	41	15%	209	12%
20+	1	1%	2	5%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	4	1%	6	1%	0	0%	8	3%	12	1%
College																												
A&S	152	90%	16	39%	66	28%	75	51%	9	12%	87	38%	2	1%	83	38%	9	30%	37	13%	136	20%	10	63%	0	0%	343	20%
BA	3	2%	5	12%	22	9%	0	0%	1	1%	29	13%	1	1%	30	14%	4	13%	42	15%	17	2%	0	0%	0	0%	408	24%
EDHD	14	8%	8	20%	64	28%	0	0%	11	14%	49	21%	140	81%	44	20%	10	33%	33	12%	162	24%	2	13%	0	0%	475	28%
HHS	0	0%	3	7%	9	4%	10	7%	48	63%	15	7%	1	1%	13	6%	2	7%	35	13%	30	4%	4	25%	0	0%	105	6%
MUS	0	0%	1	2%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	12	5%	0	0%	10	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	83	5%
TECH	0	0%	3	7%	5	2%	0	0%	0	0%	6	3%	0	0%	11	5%	1	3%	3	1%	30	4%	0	0%	0	0%	90	5%
ACEN	0	0%	5	12%	64	28%	62	42%	7	9%	31	14%	29	17%	28	13%	4	13%	130	46%	309	45%	0	0%	274	100%	187	11%
Gender																												
Female	98	58%	23	56%	126	54%	93	63%	58	76%	170	74%	151	87%	126	58%	17	57%	166	59%	423	62%	12	75%	138	50%	962	57%
Male	71	42%	18	44%	106	46%	54	37%	18	24%	59	26%	22	13%	93	42%	13	43%	114	41%	261	38%	4	25%	136	50%	729	43%
Ethnicity																												
African Am	5	3%	2	5%	21	9%	2	1%	4	5%	5	2%	4	2%	121	55%	10	33%	22	8%	46	7%	0	0%	19	7%	7	0%
Asian Am	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	4	2%	2	1%	18	8%	0	0%	0	0%	6	1%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
Hispanic	1	1%	1	2%	8	3%	7	5%	4	5%	4	2%	4	2%	71	32%	6	20%	7	3%	17	2%	0	0%	8	3%	4	0%
International	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	2	1%	4	1%	0	0%	1	0%	10	1%
Nat Am/Am Ind	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
White/Cauc	152	90%	36	88%	190	82%	135	92%	65	86%	205	90%	161	93%	0	0%	13	43%	241	86%	592	87%	16	100%	238	87%	1,619	96%
Unknown	8	5%	2	5%	9	4%	2	1%	3	4%	11	5%	2	1%	1	0%	1	3%	8	3%	18	3%	0	0%	6	2%	51	3%

Residency																												
Ohio Res	152	90%	40	98%	206	89%	140	95%	67	88%	207	90%	166	96%	172	79%	29	97%	265	95%	630	92%	15	94%	257	94%	1,607	95%
Out of State	16	9%	1	2%	25	11%	7	5%	9	12%	22	10%	7	4%	46	21%	1	3%	13	5%	50	7%	1	6%	16	6%	74	4%
International	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	2	1%	4	1%	0	0%	1	0%	10	1%
ACT																												
26-36	28	17%	8	20%	23	10%	20	14%	8	11%	166	72%	27	16%	23	11%	7	23%	27	10%	60	9%	0	0%	1	0%	235	14%
21-25	83	49%	16	39%	92	40%	60	41%	30	39%	44	19%	81	47%	90	41%	11	37%	119	43%	256	37%	8	50%	51	19%	801	47%
16-20	41	24%	15	37%	93	40%	55	37%	29	38%	3	1%	61	35%	78	36%	11	37%	110	39%	307	45%	6	38%	185	68%	555	33%
3-15	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	7	3%	1	3%	4	1%	11	2%	0	0%	17	6%	16	1%
No ACT	17	10%	2	5%	21	9%	10	7%	8	11%	16	7%	2	1%	21	10%	0	0%	16	6%	50	7%	2	13%	20	7%	84	5%
Average	22.59		22.30		21.31		21.44		21.25		27.54		21.91		19.16		21.70		21.17		20.90		20.29		18.63		20.83	
High School GPA																												
3.50-4.00	52	31%	9	22%	33	14%	27	18%	21	28%	223	97%	59	34%	48	22%	17	57%	73	26%	89	13%	1	6%	0	0%	402	24%
3.00-3.49	57	34%	11	27%	83	36%	55	37%	30	39%	4	2%	60	35%	93	42%	6	20%	65	23%	195	29%	8	50%	0	0%	640	38%
2.50-2.99	53	31%	18	44%	86	37%	55	37%	19	25%	0	0%	52	30%	58	26%	7	23%	94	34%	281	41%	7	44%	120	44%	570	34%
2.00-2.49	6	4%	3	7%	26	11%	9	6%	5	7%	1	0%	2	1%	19	9%	0	0%	45	16%	110	16%	0	0%	150	55%	62	4%
Less than 2.00	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%
No HSGPA	0	0%	0	0%	4	2%	1	1%	1	1%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	3	1%	8	1%	0	0%	3	1%	15	1%
Average	3.23		3.12		3.04		3.09		3.20		3.89		3.26		3.15		3.54		3.07		2.94		3.09		2.46		3.17	
Enrolled																												
Spring 2000	155		39		229		131		73		219		163		205		30		259		620		13		224		1,566	
Retention %	91.7%		95.1%		98.7%		89.1%		96.1%		95.6%		94.2%		93.6%		100.0%		92.5%		90.6%		81.3%		81.8%		92.6%	
Avg. Cum. GPA	3.00		2.87		2.75		2.44		2.83		3.51		3.08		2.69		3.27		2.90		2.67		2.73		2.51		2.69	
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	16		15		15		14		15		19		16		14		16		14		14		14		13		15	
Enrolled																												
Fall 2000	134		31		200		107		63		206		145		177		29		234		529		11		190		1,300	
Retention %	79.3%		75.6%		86.2%		72.8%		82.9%		90.0%		83.8%		80.8%		96.7%		83.6%		77.3%		68.8%		69.3%		76.9%	
Avg. Cum. GPA	3.00		3.06		2.86		2.70		2.90		3.51		2.99		2.77		3.11		2.87		2.69		2.93		2.42		2.82	
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	31		32		31		29		31		35		32		29		31		29		28		30		25		30	
Enrolled																												
Spring 2001	125		30		194		102		58		204		141		171		29		226		492		12		178		1,236	
Retention %	74.0%		73.2%		83.6%		69.4%		76.3%		89.1%		81.5%		78.1%		96.7%		80.7%		71.9%		75.0%		65.0%		73.1%	
Avg. Cum. GPA	3.03		3.04		2.75		2.82		2.86		3.50		3.03		2.68		3.03		2.86		2.71		2.73		2.41		2.84	
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	46		45		44		43		45		51		47		42		44		43		42		40		38		45	

Enrolled														
Fall 2001	121	26	174	103	53	200	133	153	28	210	455	12	167	1,156
Retention %	71.6%	63.4%	75.0%	70.1%	69.7%	87.3%	76.9%	69.9%	93.3%	75.0%	66.5%	75.0%	60.9%	68.4%
Avg. Cum. GPA	3.01	3.06	2.81	2.81	2.96	3.53	3.10	2.82	3.02	2.87	2.76	2.79	2.39	2.90
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	59	61	59	57	60	67	64	58	61	58	57	56	50	60
Graduated (Dec.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Graduated %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%
Enrolled														
Spring 2002	116	27	165	98	51	195	130	149	28	203	454	11	159	1,120
Retention %	68.6%	65.9%	71.1%	66.7%	67.1%	85.2%	75.1%	68.0%	93.3%	72.5%	66.4%	68.8%	58.0%	66.2%
Avg. Cum. GPA	3.04	3.08	2.82	2.89	3.01	3.54	3.18	2.83	3.00	2.90	2.80	2.96	2.47	2.93
Avg. Cum. Cr. Hrs.	73	74	73	72	74	82	79	72	74	72	71	74	64	75

Office of Institutional Research, February 2001

Note: 52% of students were participants in at least one first year program.

Table 4
Profile of First Year Program Participants
Fall 2000
New Full-Time First Year Students

Total Enrolled Fall 2000	BG Effect		Chapman Learning Community		Health Sciences Residential Community		Honors		Literacy Serve and Learn		Multicultural and Academic Initiatives		President's Leadership Academy		Springboard		UNIV 100		UNIV 131		University Program for Academic Success		Full-Time No First Year Program	
	34		183		48		236		101		207		23		304		670		10		228		1,804	
Age (15th Day)																								
Below 18	2	6%	3	2%	2	4%	10	4%	4	4%	13	6%	2	9%	8	3%	19	3%	0	0%	8	4%	58	3%
18	25	74%	143	78%	41	85%	203	86%	88	87%	169	82%	17	74%	243	80%	557	83%	7	70%	177	78%	1,468	81%
19	3	9%	35	19%	3	6%	23	10%	7	7%	21	10%	3	13%	48	16%	88	13%	3	30%	41	18%	248	14%
20+	4	12%	2	1%	2	4%	0	0%	2	2%	4	2%	1	4%	5	2%	6	1%	0	0%	2	1%	30	2%
College																								
A&S	7	21%	64	35%	11	23%	104	44%	4	4%	75	36%	6	26%	38	13%	117	17%	2	20%	0	0%	497	28%
BA	5	15%	17	9%	2	4%	25	11%	3	3%	30	14%	5	22%	54	18%	20	3%	0	0%	0	0%	363	20%
EDHD	13	38%	37	20%	5	10%	46	19%	77	76%	27	13%	7	30%	66	22%	179	27%	2	20%	0	0%	406	23%
HHS	2	6%	5	3%	28	58%	13	6%	5	5%	18	9%	1	4%	6	2%	41	6%	1	10%	0	0%	108	6%
MUS	2	6%	1	1%	0	0%	16	7%	0	0%	9	4%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	80	4%
TECH	0	0%	5	3%	0	0%	8	3%	0	0%	17	8%	1	4%	2	1%	26	4%	1	10%	0	0%	120	7%
ACEN	5	15%	54	30%	2	4%	24	10%	12	12%	31	15%	3	13%	137	45%	287	43%	4	40%	228	100%	230	13%
Gender																								
Female	25	74%	98	54%	35	73%	168	71%	86	85%	106	51%	13	57%	201	66%	398	59%	6	60%	109	48%	962	53%
Male	9	26%	85	46%	13	27%	68	29%	15	15%	101	49%	10	43%	103	34%	272	41%	4	40%	119	52%	842	47%
Ethnicity																								
African Am	0	0%	20	11%	9	19%	2	1%	1	1%	114	55%	12	52%	15	5%	45	7%	0	0%	22	10%	18	1%
Asian Am	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	6	1%	0	0%	2	1%	16	1%
Hispanic	0	0%	4	2%	1	2%	7	3%	3	3%	77	37%	2	9%	10	3%	19	3%	0	0%	9	4%	3	0%
International	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	1%	0	0%	0	0%	9	0%
Nat Amer/Am Ind	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	1	1%	12	6%	0	0%	2	1%	2	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%
White/Cauc	32	94%	154	84%	37	77%	209	89%	95	94%	1	0%	9	39%	260	86%	580	87%	10	100%	186	82%	1,699	94%
Unknown	2	6%	4	2%	1	2%	12	5%	1	1%	2	1%	0	0%	14	5%	12	2%	0	0%	8	4%	58	3%

Residency																								
Ohio Res	34	100%	163	89%	39	81%	207	88%	98	97%	152	73%	18	78%	287	94%	618	92%	10	100%	211	93%	1,678	93%
Out of State	0	0%	20	11%	9	19%	28	12%	3	3%	54	26%	5	22%	17	6%	46	7%	0	0%	17	7%	116	6%
International	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	1%	0	0%	0	0%	10	1%
ACT																								
26-36	6	18%	19	10%	7	15%	172	73%	14	14%	16	8%	4	17%	12	4%	47	7%	2	20%	2	1%	218	12%
21-25	14	41%	64	35%	14	29%	46	19%	38	38%	82	40%	5	22%	93	31%	266	40%	3	30%	39	17%	806	45%
16-20	11	32%	75	41%	21	44%	2	1%	44	44%	70	34%	10	43%	164	54%	286	43%	4	40%	148	65%	626	35%
3-15	0	0%	6	3%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	13	6%	1	4%	11	4%	18	3%	0	0%	25	11%	19	1%
No ACT	3	9%	19	10%	5	10%	16	7%	5	5%	26	13%	3	13%	24	8%	53	8%	1	10%	14	6%	135	7%
Average	21.84		20.88		21.07		27.46		21.60		20.76		20.65		20.01		20.76		22.11		18.41		21.75	
High School GPA																								
3.50-4.00	9	26%	35	19%	16	33%	226	96%	26	26%	45	22%	7	30%	49	16%	113	17%	2	20%	1	0%	436	24%
3.00-3.49	13	38%	54	30%	17	35%	9	4%	49	49%	82	40%	13	57%	84	28%	202	30%	4	40%	4	2%	690	38%
2.50-2.99	11	32%	77	42%	13	27%	0	0%	20	20%	64	31%	2	9%	130	43%	258	39%	4	40%	105	46%	594	33%
2.00-2.49	0	0%	16	9%	1	2%	0	0%	6	6%	14	7%	0	0%	39	13%	85	13%	0	0%	115	50%	69	4%
Less than 2.00	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	3	1%	1	0%
No HSGPA	0	0%	1	1%	1	2%	1	0%	0	0%	2	1%	1	4%	1	0%	10	1%	0	0%	0	0%	14	1%
Average	3.12		3.04		3.31		3.93		3.24		3.14		3.44		2.99		3.01		3.17		2.50		3.18	
Enrolled																								
Spring 2001	30		170		46		233		96		196		23		268		608		9		172		1,638	
Retention %	88.2%		92.9%		95.8%		98.7%		95.0%		94.7%		100.0%		88.2%		90.7%		90.0%		75.4%		90.8%	
Average Cum. GPA	2.94		2.84		2.73		3.5		2.98		2.60		2.56		2.66		2.76		2.76		2.56		2.64	
Average Cum. SCH	15		14		15		20		16		14		14		14		14		20		12		15	
Enrolled																								
Fall 2001	25		146		39		218		83		172		21		232		520		8		163		1,372	
Retention %	73.5%		79.8%		81.3%		92.4%		82.2%		83.1%		91.3%		76.3%		77.6%		80.0%		71.5%		76.1%	
Average Cum. GPA	2.94		2.92		2.88		3.57		3.10		2.73		2.87		2.77		2.75		2.88		2.35		2.80	
Average Cum. SCH	30		30		32		37		32		30		30		29		28		39		24		30	
Enrolled																								
Spring 2002	23		138		36		216		81		166		21		221		487		7		146		1,305	
Retention %	67.6%		75.4%		75.0%		91.5%		80.2%		80.2%		91.3%		72.7%		72.7%		70.0%		64.0%		72.3%	
Average Cum. GPA	2.98		2.83		2.88		3.58		3.16		2.67		2.95		2.80		2.80		2.74		2.41		2.84	
Average Cum. SCH	44		43		46		62		47		42		45		43		42		51		37		44	

Office of Institutional Research, February 2002

Note: 47% of students were participants in at least one first year program.

Table 5

Profile of First Year Program Participants

Fall 2001

New Full-Time First Year Students

	AIMS		BG Effect		Chapman Learning Community		Health Sciences Residential Community		Honors		IMPACT		Literacy Serve and Learn		Multicultural and Academic Initiatives		PCC		President's Leadership Academy		Springboard		UNIV 100		UNIV 131		University Program for Academic Success		Full-Time No First Year Program	
Total Enrolled Fall 2001	10		12		152		52		222		5		98		234		13		14		299		850		2		315		1,825	
Age (15th Day)																														
Below 18	2	20%	0	0%	7	5%	2	4%	9	4%	0	0%	7	7%	22	9%	1	8%	0	0%	9	3%	22	3%	0	0%	13	4%	53	3%
18	6	60%	9	75%	121	80%	44	85%	196	88%	4	80%	82	84%	194	83%	9	69%	13	93%	240	80%	685	81%	2	100%	242	77%	1,510	83%
19	2	20%	2	17%	23	15%	6	12%	16	7%	1	20%	7	7%	16	7%	3	23%	1	7%	47	16%	131	15%	0	0%	55	17%	235	13%
20+	0	0%	1	8%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	2	2%	2	1%	0	0%		0%	3	1%	12	1%	0	0%	5	2%	27	1%
College																														
A&S	9	90%	4	33%	36	24%	12	23%	95	43%	3	60%	0	0%	87	37%	0	0%	5	36%	26	9%	154	18%	1	50%	0	0%	562	31%
BA	0	0%	2	17%	27	18%	0	0%	28	13%	0	0%	4	4%	36	15%	0	0%	2	14%	104	35%	18	2%	0	0%	0	0%	355	19%
EDHD	1	10%	3	25%	39	26%	5	10%	41	18%	0	0%	49	50%	41	18%	12	92%	4	29%	71	24%	210	25%	0	0%	0	0%	407	22%
HHS	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	31	60%	12	5%	0	0%	10	10%	19	8%	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%	50	6%	0	0%	0	0%	108	6%
MUS	0	0%	1	8%	1	1%	0	0%	22	10%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	73	4%
TECH	0	0%	0	0%	8	5%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	0	0%	12	5%	0	0%	1	7%	5	2%	41	5%	0	0%	0	0%	120	7%
ACEN	0	0%	1	8%	41	27%	4	8%	19	9%	0	0%	35	36%	39	17%	1	8%	2	14%	88	29%	377	44%	1	50%	315	100%	199	11%
Gender																														
Female	8	80%	8	67%	78	51%	41	79%	161	73%	5	100%	84	86%	142	61%	8	62%	9	64%	182	61%	507	60%	2	100%	130	41%	1,005	55%
Male	2	20%	2	17%	74	49%	11	21%	61	27%	0	0%	14	14%	92	39%	5	38%	5	36%	117	39%	343	40%	0	0%	185	59%	820	45%
Ethnicity																														
African Am	7	70%	0	0%	16	11%	6	12%	8	4%	0	0%	2	2%	128	55%	0	0%	3	21%	13	4%	53	6%	0	0%	24	8%	19	1%
Asian Am	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	0	0%	20	9%	0	0%	1	7%	1	0%	4	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%
Hispanic	0	0%	0	0%	4	3%	2	4%	3	1%	0	0%	3	3%	70	30%	1	8%	1	7%	8	3%	14	2%	0	0%	5	2%	6	0%
International	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	8	1%	0	0%	1	0%	11	1%
Nat Amer/Am Ind	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	1%	15	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	5	1%	0	0%	3	1%	1	0%
White/Cauc	2	20%	11	92%	125	82%	43	83%	196	88%	5	100%	87	89%	0	0%	12	92%	9	64%	271	91%	744	88%	2	100%	275	87%	1,737	95%
Unknown	1	10%	0	0%	6	4%	1	2%	9	4%	0	0%	3	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	22	3%	0	0%	6	2%	50	3%

Residency																														
Ohio Res	8	80%	12	100%	140	92%	48	92%	199	90%	5	100%	93	95%	177	76%	13	100%	12	86%	275	92%	781	92%	2	100%	297	94%	1,734	95%
Out of State	2	20%	0	0%	12	8%	4	8%	23	10%	0	0%	3	3%	57	24%	0	0%	2	14%	22	7%	62	7%	0	0%	18	6%	80	4%
International	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	7	1%	0	0%	0	0%	11	1%
ACT																														
26-36	1	10%	2	17%	14	9%	5	10%	160	72%	5	100%	13	13%	13	6%	3	23%	2	14%	15	5%	39	5%	0	0%	1	0%	209	11%
21-25	5	50%	4	33%	64	42%	18	35%	43	19%	0	0%	40	41%	91	39%	6	46%	7	50%	134	45%	338	40%	2	100%	58	18%	873	48%
16-20	4	40%	6	50%	62	41%	27	52%	2	1%	0	0%	39	40%	87	37%	4	31%	3	21%	124	41%	379	45%	0	0%	200	63%	613	34%
3-15	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	15	6%	0	0%	1	7%	11	4%	29	3%	0	0%	33	10%	17	1%
No ACT	0	0%	0	0%	10	7%	2	4%	17	8%	0	0%	5	5%	28	12%	0	0%	1	7%	15	5%	65	8%	0	0%	23	7%	113	6%
Average	22.0		21.0		21.1		20.9		27.6		30.2		21.7		20.5		21.8		22.0		20.8		20.5		21.5		18.5		21.8	
High School GPA																														
3.50-4.00	2	20%	5	42%	24	16%	14	27%	208	94%	5	100%	26	27%	55	24%	3	23%	8	57%	53	18%	117	14%	1	50%	0	0%	425	23%
3.00-3.49	7	70%	7	58%	54	36%	23	44%	13	6%	0	0%	29	30%	102	44%	4	31%	4	29%	96	32%	252	30%	1	50%	5	2%	704	39%
2.50-2.99	1	10%	0	0%	51	34%	13	25%	1	0%	0	0%	29	30%	62	26%	4	31%	2	14%	101	34%	321	38%	0	0%	106	34%	595	33%
2.00-2.49	0	0%	0	0%	22	14%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	11	11%	13	6%	2	15%	0	0%	45	15%	148	17%	0	0%	197	63%	76	4%
Less than 2.00	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%	3	0%	0	0%	4	1%	4	0%
No HSGPA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%	9	1%	0	0%	3	1%	21	1%
Average	3.37		3.42		3.01		3.25		3.88		4.00		3.15		3.16		3.12		3.59		3.01		2.96		3.35		2.43		3.17	
Enrolled																														
Spring 2002	10		8		140		46		217		5		89		215		12		14		277		758		2		255		1,653	
Retention %	100.0%		66.7%		92.1%		88.5%		97.7%		100.0%		90.8%		91.9%		92.3%		100.0%		92.6%		89.2%		100.0%		81.0%		90.6%	
Average Cum. GPA	2.19		3.08		2.63		2.59		3.49		3.77		2.86		2.39		2.73		3.27		2.62		2.68		2.31		2.48		2.61	
Average Cum. SCH	14		14		14		15		21		20		15		14		15		17		14		14		11		11		15	

Office of Institutional Research, February 2002

Notes: Participants in these programs represent 49% of Fall 2001 main campus new full-time first year stduents.

Table 6
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting One-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.20	0.36	10.98**	3.31
UNIV 131	0.43	0.25	3.01	1.54
UNIV 100	0.22	0.14	2.60	1.25
BG Effect	-0.49	0.31	2.42	0.61
Springboard	-1.17	0.75	2.40	0.31
Honors	0.34	0.30	1.31	1.41
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.13	0.40	0.10	0.88
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Springboard	0.52	0.18	7.95**	1.68
Chapman Learning Community	0.63	0.31	4.20*	1.88
Honors	0.53	0.27	4.05*	1.71
UNIV 100	0.22	0.11	3.89*	1.25
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.58	0.31	3.47	1.78
University Program for Academic Success	-0.28	0.20	1.88	0.76
BG Effect	-0.32	0.30	1.12	0.73
President's Leadership Academy	0.41	0.78	0.29	1.51
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.05	0.30	0.03	1.06
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	0.74	0.20	13.12**	2.09
Springboard	0.50	0.18	7.43**	1.65
UNIV 100	0.29	0.11	6.56*	1.34
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.37	0.22	2.90	1.45
President's Leadership Academy	1.24	1.04	1.43	3.46
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.28	0.32	0.80	1.33
Honors	0.18	0.24	0.55	1.20
BG Effect	-0.18	0.38	0.23	0.83
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.16	0.41	0.16	0.85
University Program for Academic Success	-0.03	0.17	0.03	0.97
Fall 2000 Cohort				
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.58	0.30	3.81	1.79
UNIV 100	0.21	0.12	3.40	1.24
Honors	0.47	0.27	3.15	1.61
University Program for Academic Success	0.26	0.18	1.96	1.26
Chapman Learning Community	0.23	0.20	1.40	0.98
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.27	0.27	0.99	1.31
President's Leadership Academy	0.70	0.76	0.84	2.01
Springboard	0.07	0.16	0.22	1.08
BG Effect	-0.11	0.42	0.06	0.90
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.04	0.38	0.01	0.96

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 7
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Two-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	0.85	0.28	9.33**	2.33
UNIV 131	0.62	0.23	6.95**	1.85
UNIV 100	0.30	0.13	5.57*	1.35
Springboard	-1.16	0.64	3.27	0.32
BG Effect	-0.42	0.30	1.99	0.65
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.32	0.37	0.72	0.73
Honors	0.11	0.25	0.19	1.12
Fall 1998 Cohort				
UNIV 100	0.32	0.10	9.76**	1.38
University Program for Academic Success	-0.45	0.19	6.04*	0.63
Springboard	0.38	0.16	5.91*	1.47
Honors	0.48	0.22	4.57*	1.61
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.50	0.28	3.28	1.65
Chapman Learning Community	0.24	0.24	1.00	1.27
President's Leadership Academy	-0.31	0.53	0.33	0.74
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.14	0.27	0.25	1.15
BG Effect	-0.14	0.30	0.22	0.87
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	0.42	0.16	6.73*	1.52
Honors	0.46	0.22	4.30*	1.58
Springboard	0.32	0.16	4.11*	1.38
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.34	0.19	3.19	1.40
President's Leadership Academy	1.22	0.75	2.62	3.39
BG Effect	-0.38	0.34	1.26	0.68
UNIV 100	0.11	0.10	1.19	1.12
University Program for Academic Success	0.12	0.16	0.56	1.12
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.20	0.36	0.30	1.22
Health Sciences Learning Community	-0.05	0.26	0.04	0.95

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Three-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	0.75	0.26	8.65**	2.13
UNIV 131	0.57	0.22	6.81**	1.77
UNIV 100	0.26	0.12	4.42*	1.29
Springboard	-0.84	0.63	1.78	0.43
BG Effect	-0.38	0.29	1.64	0.69
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.41	0.37	1.23	0.66
Honors	-0.02	0.23	0.01	0.98
Fall 1998 Cohort				
UNIV 100	0.25	0.10	6.59*	1.29
University Program for Academic Success	-0.29	0.18	2.58	0.75
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.39	0.27	2.01	1.47
Springboard	0.19	0.15	1.67	1.21
President's Leadership Academy	-0.45	0.49	0.85	0.64
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.21	0.26	0.66	1.24
Honors	0.08	0.18	0.19	1.09
BG Effect	-0.11	0.30	0.13	0.90
Chapman Learning Community	0.05	0.22	0.06	1.05

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 9
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Four-Year Graduation After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	0.52	0.24	4.74*	1.69
UNIV 131	-0.15	0.22	0.48	0.86
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.28	0.45	0.39	0.75
Honors	0.11	0.19	0.30	1.11
UNIV 100	-0.07	0.13	0.27	0.94
BG Effect	-0.11	0.30	0.12	0.90
Springboard	0.10	0.63	0.02	1.10

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 10
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Chapman Learning Community	0.44	0.07	0.12**
Honors	0.24	0.06	0.08**
UNIV 100	0.08	0.04	0.04
BG Effect	-0.17	0.09	-0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.11	0.12	-0.03
UNIV 131	0.09	0.06	0.03
Springboard	-0.21	0.19	-0.02
Fall 1998 Cohort			
University Program for Academic Success	0.29	0.06	0.08**
Honors	0.22	0.05	0.07**
Chapman Learning Community	0.20	0.07	0.04*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.10	0.09	0.03
UNIV 100	0.07	0.03	0.03
BG Effect	-0.13	0.10	-0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.04	0.08	0.01
Springboard	0.03	0.05	0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.03	0.16	-0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
University Program for Academic Success	0.20	0.05	0.07**
Honors	0.15	0.05	0.05**
Springboard	0.15	0.05	0.05**
Chapman Learning Community	0.13	0.05	0.04**
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.15	0.05	0.04**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.24	0.12	-0.08*
UNIV 100	0.07	0.03	0.04*
BG Effect	0.04	0.11	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.05	0.08	0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.05	0.13	-0.00
Fall 2000 Cohort			
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.26	0.09	0.08**
University Program for Academic Success	0.29	0.06	0.08**
Chapman Learning Community	0.21	0.05	0.06**
Honors	0.17	0.05	0.06**
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.17	0.07	0.04*
Springboard	0.11	0.05	0.04*
UNIV 100	0.08	0.03	0.04**
President's Leadership Academy	-0.21	0.14	-0.02
BG Effect	0.11	0.12	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.08	0.10	-0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: R^2 = .32 (N = 2,074, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: R^2 = .36 (N = 3,138, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: R^2 = .34 (N = 3,087, p < .01).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: R^2 = .33 (N = 2,935, p < .01).
*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 11
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.24	0.05	0.11**
Chapman Learning Community	0.13	0.06	0.05*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.15	0.10	0.04
Springboard	0.20	0.18	0.02
BG Effect	0.06	0.08	0.01
UNIV 100	0.08	0.03	0.01
UNIV 131	-0.01	0.05	-0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.24	0.04	0.11**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.11	0.07	0.04
BG Effect	0.18	0.09	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-0.18	0.12	-0.03
UNIV 100	0.04	0.03	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.03	0.06	-0.01
Springboard	-0.02	0.04	-0.01
Chapman Learning Community	-0.03	0.06	-0.00
University Program for Academic Success	-0.01	0.06	-0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	0.16	0.04	0.07**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.15	0.10	-0.06
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.13	0.04	0.05**
Springboard	0.08	0.04	0.04*
BG Effect	0.14	0.09	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.09	0.07	0.02
President's Leadership Academy	-0.11	0.10	-0.02
University Program for Academic Success	0.05	0.05	0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.02	0.04	-0.01
UNIV 100	0.02	0.03	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .36$ ($N = 1,649$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .40$ ($N = 2,538$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .39$ ($N = 2,485$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 12
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Third Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.22	0.05	0.11**
Chapman Learning Community	0.15	0.06	0.06*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.13	0.10	0.04
BG Effect	-0.05	0.08	-0.02
Springboard	0.18	0.18	0.02
UNIV 100	0.02	0.03	0.02
UNIV 131	-0.06	0.05	0.00
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.21	0.04	0.10**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.10	0.07	0.04
University Program for Academic Success	0.09	0.06	0.03
BG Effect	0.09	0.09	0.02
UNIV 100	0.03	0.02	0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.03	0.06	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.03	0.06	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.03	0.12	-0.00
Springboard	-0.07	0.04	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .35$ ($N = 1,540$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .40$ ($N = 2,313$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 13
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.23	0.05	0.12**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.17	0.10	0.06
Chapman Learning Community	0.11	0.05	0.05*
UNIV 100	-0.07	0.03	-0.01
UNIV 131	0.02	0.05	0.01
BG Effect	0.03	0.07	0.01
Springboard	-0.04	0.16	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .34$ ($N = 1,418$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 14
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	4.52	0.58	0.17**
Chapman Learning Community	2.48	0.66	0.08**
BG Effect	-1.73	0.85	-0.04*
Springboard	-1.59	1.79	-0.02
UNIV 100	0.38	0.35	0.02
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.43	1.09	0.01
UNIV 131	0.18	0.58	0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	3.35	0.48	0.12**
BG Effect	-2.17	0.98	-0.04*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.84	0.87	0.03
Chapman Learning Community	0.58	0.68	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.09	0.77	0.01
Springboard	-0.15	0.46	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.38	1.55	-0.00
UNIV 100	0.07	0.30	-0.00
University Program for Academic Success	0.11	0.63	0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	1.75	0.49	0.06**
Chapman Learning Community	1.20	0.44	0.04**
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.63	0.51	0.05**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.45	1.15	0.02
President's Leadership Academy	1.16	1.25	0.02
BG Effect	-0.30	1.04	-0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.63	0.76	0.01
Springboard	0.18	0.45	0.01
University Program for Academic Success	-0.17	0.50	-0.01
UNIV 100	0.04	0.30	0.00
Fall 2000 Cohort			
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.59	0.88	0.09**
Honors	2.34	0.52	0.08**
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.53	0.69	0.04*
Chapman Learning Community	0.92	0.53	0.03
University Program for Academic Success	0.75	0.59	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.48	1.01	0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-1.22	1.44	-0.01
Springboard	0.31	0.46	0.01
BG Effect	0.07	1.24	0.00
UNIV 100	-0.03	0.32	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: R^2 = .25 (N = 2,074, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: R^2 = .26 (N = 3,138, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: R^2 = .21 (N = 3,086, p < .01).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: R^2 = .24 (N = 2,935, p < .01).
*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 15
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	6.06	0.90	0.17**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.17	1.90	0.06
UNIV 100	0.67	0.58	0.03
Chapman Learning Community	0.91	1.07	0.02
UNIV 131	-0.61	0.93	-0.02
Springboard	2.06	3.30	0.01
BG Effect	0.59	1.50	0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	3.98	0.73	0.11**
University Program for Academic Success	-2.52	1.04	-0.05*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1,55	1.39	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-3.25	2.24	-0.03
UNIV 100	0.66	0.48	0.03
Chapman Learning Community	0.85	1.09	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.43	1.18	0.01
Springboard	-0.47	0.71	-0.01
BG Effect	-0.15	1.70	-0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	1.97	0.73	0.05**
Literacy Serve and Learn	2.28	0.79	0.05**
University Program for Academic Success	-1.89	0.82	-0.05*
BG Effect	1.78	1.72	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.15	1.23	0.02
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.85	1.80	0.02
Springboard	-0.75	0.70	-0.02
UNIV 100	-0.62	0.47	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.29	0.69	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	0.63	1.84	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .22$ ($N = 1,649$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .26$ ($N = 2,538$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .23$ ($N = 2,485$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 16
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Third Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	7.47	1.36	0.14**
Chapman Learning Community	3.32	1.68	0.05*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.58	3.03	0.03
Springboard	3.51	5.23	0.02
UNIV 100	0.86	0.89	0.02
BG Effect	0.93	2.26	0.01
UNIV 131	-0.45	1.43	-0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	3.37	1.04	0.07**
Chapman Learning Community	3.75	1.65	0.04*
UNIV 100	1.29	0.69	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.91	2.10	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-2.91	3.48	-0.02
Springboard	1.01	1.06	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.07	1.74	0.01
University Program for Academic Success	-0.97	1.62	-0.01
BG Effect	-0.48	2.56	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .20$ ($N = 1,540$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .23$ ($N = 2,313$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 17
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	6.50	1.71	0.10**
Chapman Learning Community	4.35	1.98	0.06*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.67	3.76	0.04
BG Effect	2.19	2.77	0.02
Springboard	-3.09	5.77	-0.01
UNIV 100	0.39	1.08	0.01
UNIV 131	-0.65	1.72	-0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .16$ ($N = 1,418$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 18
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting One-Year Retention After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.66	0.61	7.46**	5.25
Springboard	-1.73	1.01	2.93	0.18
BG Effect	-0.51	0.37	1.90	0.60
UNIV 100	0.10	0.17	0.35	1.10
Honors	0.14	0.32	0.19	1.15
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.12	0.53	0.05	1.13
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Honors	1.09	0.36	8.97**	2.98
Springboard	0.66	0.26	6.66**	1.93
Chapman Learning Community	1.42	0.60	5.50*	4.12
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.67	0.40	2.84	1.95
UNIV 100	0.21	0.14	2.18	1.24
University Program for Academic Success	-0.37	0.29	1.55	0.69
BG Effect	-0.22	0.42	0.28	0.80
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.01	0.34	0.00	1.01
President's Leadership Academy	0.06	0.81	0.00	1.06
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.16	0.32	13.46**	3.18
UNIV 100	0.42	0.15	7.97**	1.52
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.41	0.23	3.05	1.51
Honors	0.43	0.30	2.14	1.54
Springboard	0.27	0.23	1.38	1.31
President's Leadership Academy	0.90	1.08	0.71	2.47
University Program for Academic Success	0.11	0.24	0.20	1.11
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.24	0.58	0.17	1.27
BG Effect	-0.19	0.49	0.15	0.82
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.10	0.34	0.09	1.11
Fall 2000 Cohort				
UNIV 100	-0.36	0.15	5.70*	0.69
Honors	-0.40	0.31	1.68	0.67
Chapman Learning Community	-0.32	0.28	1.25	0.73
University Program for Academic Success	-0.26	0.26	0.99	0.77
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.24	0.29	0.72	0.78
President's Leadership Academy	-4.48	6.27	0.51	0.01
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.27	0.44	0.38	0.77
BG Effect	0.13	0.50	0.07	1.14
Springboard	0.04	0.19	0.05	1.04
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.04	0.47	0.01	1.04

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 19
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting One-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
UNIV 100	1.02	0.53	3.68	2.77
Chapman Learning Community	2.06	1.07	3.67	7.82
BG Effect	-1.76	1.53	1.33	0.17
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.39	0.46	0.71	0.68
Honors	-0.53	0.82	0.41	0.59
Springboard	3.14	22.27	0.02	23.11
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Honors	-1.49	0.80	3.44	0.23
Springboard	1.34	0.91	2.14	3.81
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.45	0.33	1.84	1.57
UNIV 100	-0.28	0.36	0.62	0.76
President's Leadership Academy	-0.50	0.99	0.25	0.61
Chapman Learning Community	-0.36	0.74	0.24	0.69
BG Effect	12.19	31.46	0.15	197656.77
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.26	0.85	0.10	1.30
University Program for Academic Success	-6.47	22.24	0.08	0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.50	0.69	4.68*	4.47
Springboard	2.19	1.11	3.94*	8.97
UNIV 100	0.73	0.41	3.22	2.08
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.93	0.64	2.09	0.39
University Program for Academic Success	-0.82	0.73	1.26	0.44
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.63	1.13	0.31	1.88
Honors	7.08	26.44	0.07	1208.09
President's Leadership Academy	5.88	21.59	0.07	358.00
Literacy Serve and Learn	7.28	28.85	0.06	1452.07
BG Effect	6.76	53.37	0.02	864.23
Fall 2000 Cohort				
University Program for Academic Success	1.68	0.58	8.26**	5.37
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.74	0.33	5.08*	2.10
UNIV 100	-0.52	0.35	2.23	0.59
Springboard	-0.59	0.53	1.25	0.55
Chapman Learning Community	-0.22	0.54	0.17	0.80
President's Leadership Academy	7.71	26.48	0.08	2225.68
Literacy Serve and Learn	6.82	41.42	0.07	916.19
Health Sciences Residential Community	7.01	29.66	0.06	1109.14
Honors	0.19	1.12	0.03	1.21

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 20
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting One-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Honors	0.53	0.29	3.31	1.70
Springboard	-1.56	1.15	1.85	0.21
UNIV 100	-0.32	0.23	1.84	0.73
Chapman Learning Community	0.70	0.75	0.87	2.01
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.61	0.78	0.62	0.54
BG Effect	-0.07	0.46	0.02	0.93
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Honors	0.90	0.26	12.06**	2.45
Springboard	0.72	0.38	3.55	2.05
Chapman Learning Community	1.83	1.02	3.24	6.25
UNIV 100	0.22	0.21	1.04	1.24
President's Leadership Academy	3.86	6.63	0.34	47.55
University Program for Academic Success	-7.70	22.25	0.12	0.00
BG Effect	-0.24	0.79	0.10	0.78
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.07	0.42	0.03	0.93
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.45	0.66	0.00	0.96
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Honors	0.61	0.23	6.69**	1.83
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.76	0.36	4.50*	2.14
UNIV 100	0.29	0.22	1.74	1.34
Chapman Learning Community	0.44	0.33	1.72	1.55
Springboard	0.34	0.33	1.01	1.40
President's Leadership Academy	0.86	1.08	0.62	2.35
BG Effect	0.55	0.76	0.53	1.74
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-4.27	7.85	0.30	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.27	0.49	0.29	1.30
Fall 2000 Cohort				
Honors	-0.93	0.26	12.98**	0.39
UNIV 100	-0.45	0.22	4.23	0.64
Springboard	-0.58	0.33	3.09	0.56
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.92	0.55	2.76	0.40
BG Effect	0.75	0.61	1.54	2.12
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.41	0.44	0.84	0.67
University Program for Academic Success	-3.22	7.70	0.18	0.04
Chapman Learning Community	-0.14	0.37	0.14	0.87
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.10	0.56	0.04	1.10
President's Leadership Academy	-0.12	0.80	0.02	0.89

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 21
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Two-Year Retention After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.33	0.45	8.61**	3.76
Springboard	-1.58	0.84	3.52	0.21
UNIV 100	0.22	0.16	2.03	1.25
BG Effect	-0.44	0.35	1.52	0.65
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.18	0.48	0.14	0.84
Honors	-0.03	0.28	0.01	0.98
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Springboard	0.68	0.22	9.40**	1.97
UNIV 100	0.38	0.13	8.37**	1.46
Honors	0.75	0.28	7.19**	2.12
University Program for Academic Success	-0.65	0.28	5.49*	0.52
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.75	0.36	4.25*	2.12
Chapman Learning Community	0.49	0.37	1.76	1.63
President's Leadership Academy	-0.40	0.64	0.39	0.67
BG Effect	-0.02	0.42	0.00	0.98
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.01	0.30	0.00	0.99
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	0.70	0.24	8.68**	2.01
Honors	0.62	0.26	5.69*	1.86
UNIV 100	0.28	0.13	4.56*	1.32
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.40	0.21	3.74	1.49
President's Leadership Academy	1.52	10.8	1.99	4.59
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.70	0.55	1.60	2.01
Springboard	0.23	0.20	1.23	1.26
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.20	0.29	0.49	0.82
University Program for Academic Success	0.00	0.21	0.01	1.00
BG Effect	-0.01	0.47	0.00	0.99

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 22
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Two-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.40	0.70	4.05*	4.07
UNIV 100	0.60	0.45	1.73	1.81
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.39	0.42	0.85	0.68
BG Effect	-0.82	1.49	0.30	0.44
Honors	0.18	0.79	0.05	1.20
Springboard	4.41	22.25	0.04	82.07
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Springboard	1.28	0.72	3.14	3.60
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.47	0.29	2.54	1.59
President's Leadership Academy	-1.28	0.82	2.45	0.28
Chapman Learning Community	-0.55	0.63	0.76	0.58
Honors	-0.59	0.76	0.61	0.56
UNIV 100	-0.25	0.32	0.60	0.78
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.31	0.73	0.19	1.37
University Program for Academic Success	-5.75	22.24	0.07	0.00
BG Effect	-0.61	31.45	0.00	0.54
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Springboard	1.56	0.78	3.95*	4.74
BG Effect	-2.26	1.50	2.28	0.10
Chapman Learning Community	0.60	0.48	1.55	1.83
Honors	1.18	1.09	1.17	3.26
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.02	1.12	0.84	2.78
President's Leadership Academy	0.91	1.33	0.47	2.49
University Program for Academic Success	-0.41	0.63	0.41	0.67
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.33	0.88	0.14	1.39
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.18	0.51	0.12	0.84
UNIV 100	-0.02	0.33	0.00	0.98

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 23
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Two-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Honors	0.38	0.25	2.41	1.47
Springboard	-1.48	1.00	2.20	0.23
UNIV 100	-0.21	0.22	0.94	0.81
Chapman Learning Community	0.25	0.56	0.20	1.28
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.22	0.62	0.13	0.80
BG Effect	0.04	0.43	0.01	1.04
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Honors	0.87	0.22	16.18**	2.38
UNIV 100	0.36	0.19	3.54	1.44
Springboard	0.51	0.29	2.99	1.66
Chapman Learning Community	0.32	0.46	0.50	1.38
University Program for Academic Success	-6.67	13.52	0.24	0.00
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.26	0.59	0.20	0.77
BG Effect	0.19	0.78	0.06	1.21
President's Leadership Academy	-0.20	0.85	0.06	0.82
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.00	0.38	0.00	1.00
Fall 1999 Cohort				
Honors	0.85	0.21	15.82**	2.34
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.62	0.29	4.53*	1.86
President's Leadership Academy	1.64	1.07	2.38	5.17
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.43	0.36	1.43	0.65
Chapman Learning Community	0.28	0.27	1.07	1.33
BG Effect	-0.44	0.51	0.73	0.65
UNIV 100	0.10	0.18	0.32	1.11
Springboard	0.10	0.27	0.14	1.11
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.26	0.86	0.09	1.30

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 24
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Three-Year Retention After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.21	0.40	8.97**	3.36
Springboard	-1.74	0.79	4.88*	0.18
BG Effect	-0.45	0.34	1.68	0.64
UNIV 100	0.18	0.15	1.45	1.20
Honors	-0.04	0.26	0.02	0.96
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.03	0.46	0.00	1.03
Fall 1998 Cohort				
UNIV 100	0.30	0.13	5.92*	1.36
Springboard	0.46	0.20	5.30*	1.59
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.66	0.36	3.41	1.94
Honors	0.41	0.24	2.96	1.50
University Program for Academic Success	-0.45	0.27	2.74	0.64
President's Leadership Academy	-0.75	0.58	1.69	0.47
Chapman Learning Community	0.21	0.33	0.41	1.24
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.12	0.29	0.16	1.12
BG Effect	-0.09	0.41	0.05	0.91

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 25

Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Three-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	1.31	0.64	4.19*	3.69
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.45	0.42	1.17	0.64
UNIV 100	0.32	0.44	0.54	1.38
Honors	0.27	0.79	0.12	0.73
BG Effect	-0.30	1.50	0.04	0.74
Springboard	4.63	22.25	0.04	102.61
Fall 1998 Cohort				
President's Leadership Academy	-1.19	0.77	2.40	0.30
Honors	-1.01	0.71	2.03	0.36
Springboard	0.83	0.65	1.65	2.30
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.01	0.83	1.50	2.75
UNIV 100	-0.38	0.32	1.42	0.68
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.33	0.29	1.28	1.39
Chapman Learning Community	-0.69	0.62	1.24	0.50
University Program for Academic Success	-5.60	22.24	0.06	0.00
BG Effect	-0.59	31.45	0.00	0.56

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 26
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Three-Year Retention After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Honors	0.27	0.23	1.47	1.32
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.59	0.63	0.87	0.55
UNIV 100	-0.19	0.21	0.82	0.83
Springboard	-0.93	0.96	0.95	0.39
BG Effect	-0.09	0.39	0.05	0.91
Chapman Learning Community	-0.10	0.49	0.05	0.90
Fall 1998 Cohort				
Honors	0.48	0.18	7.22**	1.62
Springboard	0.44	0.27	2.77	1.56
UNIV 100	0.24	0.18	1.86	1.27
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.42	0.58	0.54	0.66
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.26	0.38	0.45	1.29
President's Leadership Academy	-0.46	0.74	0.39	0.63
University Program for Academic Success	-5.16	8.23	0.39	0.01
Chapman Learning Community	-0.14	0.38	0.13	0.87
BG Effect	-0.09	0.67	0.01	0.92

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 27

Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Four-Year Graduation After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Chapman Learning Community	0.20	0.32	0.39	1.23
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.27	0.51	0.27	0.76
BG Effect	-0.16	0.35	0.23	0.85
UNIV 100	0.06	0.15	0.19	1.07
Honors	0.01	0.23	0.00	1.01
Springboard	0.00	0.75	0.00	1.00

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 28
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Four-Year Graduation After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
UNIV 100	-0.98	0.62	2.48	0.38
Chapman Learning Community	0.81	0.70	1.32	2.25
BG Effect	-5.01	25.71	0.04	0.01
Honors	0.15	0.77	0.04	1.17
Springboard	6.93	36.66	0.04	1024.00
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.07	0.51	0.02	0.93

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 29
Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Four-Year Graduation After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	Wald	Exp (B)
Fall 1997 Cohort				
Honors	0.49	0.18	7.34**	1.64
Chapman Learning Community	0.54	0.43	1.59	1.72
UNIV 100	-0.23	0.19	1.55	0.79
Springboard	-1.14	0.97	1.38	0.32
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.42	0.63	0.44	1.52
BG Effect	0.16	0.34	0.23	1.18

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 30
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Chapman Learning Community	0.53	0.09	0.14**
Honors	0.24	0.07	0.09**
BG Effect	-0.19	0.11	-0.04
UNIV 100	0.07	0.05	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.07	0.14	-0.02
Springboard	-0.18	0.23	-0.02
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.21	0.06	0.08**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.16	0.11	0.05
UNIV 100	0.09	0.04	0.05*
University Program for Academic Success	0.19	0.09	0.05*
Chapman Learning Community	0.19	0.09	0.04*
Springboard	0.12	0.06	0.04*
BG Effect	-0.10	0.13	-0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.03	0.09	0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.04	0.18	-0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
University Program for Academic Success	0.27	0.07	0.09**
Chapman Learning Community	0.25	0.06	0.08**
UNIV 100	0.11	0.04	0.06**
Honors	0.14	0.06	0.05*
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.16	0.05	0.05*
Springboard	0.15	0.06	0.05*
BG Effect	0.18	0.14	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.04	0.09	0.01
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.03	0.16	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.06	0.16	-0.01
Fall 2000 Cohort			
University Program for Academic Success	0.30	0.08	0.09**
Chapman Learning Community	0.28	0.07	0.08**
Honors	0.17	0.06	0.06**
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.17	0.07	0.05*
UNIV 100	0.09	0.04	0.05*
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.24	0.11	-0.04*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.13	0.11	0.04
Springboard	0.11	0.05	0.04*
BG Effect	0.11	0.14	0.02
President's Leadership Academy	0.01	0.18	0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .33$ ($N = 1,254$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .37$ ($N = 1,878$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .36$ ($N = 1,843$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: $R^2 = .36$ ($N = 1,694$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 31
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Chapman Learning Community	0.56	0.20	0.22**
Honors	0.60	0.27	0.18*
Springboard	0.74	0.74	0.07
BG Effect	0.47	0.73	0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.07	0.15	-0.04
UNIV 100	0.07	0.15	0.04
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.34	0.25	0.08
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.09	0.11	0.05
Springboard	0.06	0.21	0.02
UNIV 100	-0.04	0.12	-0.02
University Program for Academic Success	0.26	0.75	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.04	0.27	0.01
Chapman Learning Community	-0.08	0.22	0.00
President's Leadership Academy	-0.01	0.29	-0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	0.56	0.21	0.15**
Springboard	0.49	0.19	0.19*
University Program for Academic Success	0.35	0.22	0.13
President's Leadership Academy	-0.29	0.25	-0.09
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.16	0.17	-0.07
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.17	0.23	0.04
BG Effect	-0.17	0.40	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.05	0.14	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.12	0.29	0.02
UNIV 100	0.04	0.11	0.02
Fall 2000 Cohort			
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.31	0.10	0.17**
University Program for Academic Success	0.40	0.18	0.14*
Springboard	0.27	0.17	0.09
Chapman Learning Community	0.25	0.16	0.08
Honors	0.25	0.22	0.07
UNIV 100	0.12	0.11	0.06
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.32	0.34	0.05
President's Leadership Academy	0.07	0.22	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.05	0.25	-0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .39$ ($N = 125$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .27$ ($N = 242$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .36$ ($N = 238$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: $R^2 = .30$ ($N = 272$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 32
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.51	0.05	0.30**
Chapman Learning Community	0.32	0.12	0.09**
Springboard	-0.25	0.27	-0.03
UNIV 100	-0.05	0.06	-0.03
BG Effect	-0.04	0.10	-0.01
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.01	0.18	-0.00
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.57	0.05	0.31**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.15	0.15	0.05
University Program for Academic Success	-1.30	0.66	-0.05*
UNIV 100	-0.03	0.05	-0.02
BG Effect	0.08	0.18	0.01
Chapman Learning Community	0.06	0.11	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.05	0.10	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.10	0.21	-0.01
Springboard	0.09	0.07	0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	0.46	0.05	0.25**
Springboard	0.16	0.73	0.06*
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.13	0.07	0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.13	0.23	-0.05
President's Leadership Academy	0.16	0.16	0.03
BG Effect	-0.09	0.15	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.03	0.07	0.01
UNIV 100	-0.01	0.05	-0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.13	0.11	0.00
Fall 2000 Cohort			
Honors	0.50	0.05	0.27**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.29	0.13	0.10*
Chapman Learning Community	0.18	0.08	0.06*
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.18	0.09	0.05*
Springboard	0.12	0.07	0.05
President's Leadership Academy	-0.23	0.17	-0.04
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.08	0.13	-0.02
UNIV 100	0.03	0.05	0.02
BG Effect	-0.06	0.18	-0.01
University Program for Academic Success	-0.21	0.37	-0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .10$ ($N = 928$, $p < .05$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .12$ ($N = 1,535$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .08$ ($N = 1,496$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: $R^2 = .11$ ($N = 1,448$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 33
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.23	0.06	0.11**
Chapman Learning Community	0.17	0.08	0.06*
UNIV 100	0.05	0.04	0.03
BG Effect	0.08	0.10	0.02
Springboard	0.11	0.21	0.02
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.13	0.12	0.04
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.26	0.05	0.13**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.22	0.09	0.08*
BG Effect	0.29	0.12	0.05*
President's Leadership Academy	-0.23	0.14	-0.04
UNIV 100	0.04	0.03	0.03
University Program for Academic Success	-0.10	0.08	-0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.07	0.70	-0.02
Springboard	0.04	0.05	0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.03	0.08	-0.01
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	0.15	0.05	0.07**
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.16	0.04	0.07**
Springboard	0.09	0.05	0.04
University Program for Academic Success	0.10	0.06	0.04
BG Effect	0.21	0.12	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.08	0.08	0.02
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.06	0.15	0.02
President's Leadership Academy	-0.13	0.13	-0.02
UNIV 100	0.03	0.03	0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.03	0.05	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .38$ ($N = 1,002$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .40$ ($N = 1,549$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .39$ ($N = 1,493$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 34
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.62	0.23	0.25**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.18	0.13	0.14
Springboard	0.87	0.56	0.14
Chapman Learning Community	0.25	0.17	0.14
BG Effect	0.46	0.55	0.07
UNIV 100	-0.02	0.14	-0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.47	0.21	0.15*
Springboard	-0.25	0.16	-0.13
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.10	0.09	0.07
UNIV 100	-0.11	0.10	-0.07
Chapman Learning Community	-0.18	0.18	-0.06
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.13	0.20	-0.04
President's Leadership Academy	-0.03	0.21	-0.01
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	0.48	0.17	0.18**
Springboard	0.23	0.16	0.12
President's Leadership Academy	-0.27	0.20	-0.11
BG Effect	-0.49	0.33	-0.09
Chapman Learning Community	-0.12	0.12	-0.06
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.12	0.1	-0.06
UNIV 100	-0.10	0.10	-0.06
University Program for Academic Success	0.11	0.19	0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.07	0.25	0.02
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.07	0.20	0.02

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .43$ ($N = 86$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .33$ ($N = 196$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .40$ ($N = 196$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 35
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.46	0.05	0.33**
UNIV 100	-0.07	0.05	-0.05
BG Effect	0.09	0.09	0.03
Springboard	0.25	0.30	0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.07	0.16	0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.03	0.11	0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.51	0.04	0.34**
President's Leadership Academy	-0.35	0.17	-0.06*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.17	0.13	0.06
BG Effect	0.27	0.16	0.04
Chapman Learning Community	-0.14	0.09	-0.04
UNIV 100	-0.04	0.04	-0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.07	0.08	-0.02
Springboard	0.08	0.06	0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	0.40	0.04	0.26**
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.14	0.06	0.06*
Springboard	0.12	0.06	0.06
UNIV 100	-0.08	0.04	-0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.14	0.10	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.09	0.19	-0.04
Chapman Learning Community	-0.04	0.06	-0.02
BG Effect	-0.03	0.14	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	0.02	0.13	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .13$ ($N = 811$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .14$ ($N = 1,354$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .10$ ($N = 1,272$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 36
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Third Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.20	0.05	0.11**
Chapman Learning Community	0.13	0.07	0.05
UNIV 100	0.06	0.04	0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.09	0.12	0.03
Springboard	0.18	0.20	0.03
BG Effect	-0.03	0.09	-0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.22	0.04	0.12**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.21	0.09	0.09*
BG Effect	0.20	0.12	0.04
UNIV 100	0.05	0.03	0.04
President's Leadership Academy	-0.16	0.13	-0.03
Springboard	0.06	0.05	0.03
Chapman Learning Community	-0.05	0.08	-0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.05	0.07	-0.02
University Program for Academic Success	-0.05	0.08	-0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .34$ ($N = 934$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .39$ ($N = 1,413$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 37
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Third Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.47	0.19	0.24*
Chapman Learning Community	0.27	0.15	0.17
Springboard	0.74	0.47	0.15
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.12	0.12	0.10
UNIV 100	0.04	0.13	0.04
BG Effect	-0.09	0.47	-0.02
Fall 1998 Cohort			
UNIV 100	-0.18	0.09	-0.14*
Honors	0.31	0.17	0.12
Chapman Learning Community	-0.25	0.17	-0.09
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.11	0.07	0.09
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.16	0.18	-0.06
President's Leadership Academy	-0.06	0.19	-0.03
Springboard	-0.05	0.14	-0.03

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .50$ ($N = 74$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .40$ ($N = 169$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 38
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Third Academic Year Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.42	0.04	0.33**
UNIV 100	-0.06	0.05	-0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.10	0.15	0.03
BG Effect	0.04	0.09	0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.06	0.11	0.02
Springboard	0.16	0.28	0.02
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	0.46	0.04	0.34**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.18	0.13	0.07
BG Effect	0.22	0.16	0.04
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.06	0.08	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.04	0.09	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.06	0.17	-0.01
Springboard	-0.02	0.05	-0.01
UNIV 100	0.05	0.04	0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .14$ ($N = 770$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .14$ ($N = 1,274$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 39
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.19	0.05	0.11**
Chapman Learning Community	0.08	0.07	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.09	0.12	0.03
UNIV 100	0.03	0.04	0.02
Springboard	0.09	0.19	0.01
BG Effect	0.09	0.09	0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .30$ ($N = 862$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 40
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.41	0.21	0.20
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.15	0.13	0.12
Springboard	0.65	0.48	0.13
Chapman Learning Community	0.14	0.16	0.09
BG Effect	-0.22	0.48	-0.05
UNIV 100	0.02	0.14	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .49$ ($N = 66$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 41

Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative GPA at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	0.41	0.05	0.32
UNIV 100	-0.09	0.05	-0.07
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.22	0.16	0.07
BG Effect	0.10	0.09	0.04
Chapman Learning Community	0.06	0.11	0.02
Springboard	-0.10	0.27	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .13$ ($N = 714$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 42
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	3.47	0.66	0.15**
Chapman Learning Community	3.06	0.87	0.10**
BG Effect	-1.52	0.98	-0.04
Springboard	-2.56	2.11	-0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.09	1.30	0.03
UNIV 100	0.06	0.42	0.00
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	2.97	0.55	0.12**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.79	1.07	0.06
BG Effect	-2.21	1.25	-0.04
University Program for Academic Success	-1.46	0.85	-0.04
Chapman Learning Community	0.84	0.91	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.51	0.84	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-1.01	1.74	-0.01
UNIV 100	0.14	0.36	0.01
Springboard	0.07	0.56	0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	2.18	0.55	0.09**
Chapman Learning Community	1.53	0.57	0.06**
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.43	0.52	0.06**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.45	1.59	0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.65	0.83	0.02
BG Effect	0.41	1.34	0.01
President's Leadership Academy	0.36	1.57	0.01
UNIV 100	0.13	0.36	0.01
University Program for Academic Success	-0.38	0.68	-0.01
Springboard	-0.05	0.57	-0.00
Fall 2000 Cohort			
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.48	1.11	0.12**
Honors	1.10	0.58	0.05
Chapman Learning Community	1.12	0.68	0.04
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.33	0.70	0.04
University Program for Academic Success	0.63	0.76	0.02
BG Effect	0.51	1.37	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.69	1.09	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	0.67	1.80	0.01
Springboard	0.21	0.52	0.01
UNIV 100	-0.03	0.37	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .21$ ($N = 1,254$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .25$ ($N = 1,878$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .20$ ($N = 1,843$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: $R^2 = .23$ ($N = 1,694$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 43
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Chapman Learning Community	5.82	1.99	0.23**
Honors	2.57	2.67	0.08
BG Effect	2.57	7.27	0.03
Springboard	-2.75	7.37	-0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.33	1.44	0.02
UNIV 100	-0.31	1.51	-0.02
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Springboard	1.85	2.03	0.07
Honors	1.72	2.47	0.04
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.80	2.59	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.71	1.02	0.04
President's Leadership Academy	-1.64	2.78	-0.04
University Program for Academic Success	-4.54	7.27	-0.04
UNIV 100	-0.51	1.14	-0.03
Chapman Learning Community	-0.75	2.10	-0.02
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	4.74	1.97	0.15*
Literacy Serve and Learn	3.93	2.15	0.11
Springboard	2.39	1.83	0.11
Health Sciences Residential Community	4.33	2.69	0.09
University Program for Academic Success	1.39	2.03	0.06
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.07	1.56	0.05
Chapman Learning Community	0.65	1.28	0.03
BG Effect	-1.50	3.79	-0.02
President's Leadership Academy	0.67	2.35	0.02
UNIV 100	0.25	1.00	0.02
Fall 2000 Cohort			
Honors	9.49	2.41	0.22**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.06	1.13	0.10
Chapman Learning Community	1.69	1.73	0.05
President's Leadership Academy	2.06	2.37	0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.56	2.77	0.03
University Program for Academic Success	0.57	1.97	0.02
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.44	3.65	-0.01
UNIV 100	0.25	1.18	0.01
Springboard	0.10	1.80	0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .34$ ($N = 125$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .27$ ($N = 242$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .28$ ($N = 238$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: $R^2 = .33$ ($N = 272$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 44

Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the First Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	6.27	0.54	0.36**
UNIV 100	-1.40	0.55	-0.08*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.92	1.75	0.06
Chapman Learning Community	0.24	1.23	0.01
Springboard	-0.91	2.67	-0.01
BG Effect	-0.12	1.00	-0.00
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	5.75	0.44	0.32**
University Program for Academic Success	-12.01	6.36	-0.05
BG Effect	-2.84	1.78	-0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.31	1.48	0.04
UNIV 100	-0.54	0.46	-0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-1.75	1.97	-0.02
Springboard	-0.40	0.65	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.42	1.04	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.41	0.95	-0.01
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	3.67	0.44	0.21**
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.58	0.62	0.07*
UNIV 100	-0.86	0.47	-0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.95	2.15	0.04
President's Leadership Academy	1.75	1.47	0.03
BG Effect	-1.22	1.43	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.59	0.64	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.35	1.00	0.01
Springboard	-0.31	0.68	-0.01
Fall 2000 Cohort			
Honors	4.84	0.49	0.25**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.19	1.36	0.08
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.43	0.95	0.04
UNIV 100	-0.71	0.49	-0.04
Chapman Learning Community	1.06	0.85	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-2.05	1.76	-0.03
University Program for Academic Success	-3.49	3.87	-0.02
BG Effect	-0.56	1.85	-0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.41	1.32	0.01
Springboard	0.19	0.71	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .15$ ($N = 928$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .13$ ($N = 1{,}534$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .06$ ($N = 1{,}496$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort: $R^2 = .08$ ($N = 1{,}448$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 45
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	5.81	1.02	0.18**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.87	2.19	0.05
Chapman Learning Community	1.95	1.35	0.04
UNIV 100	0.82	0.69	0.03
BG Effect	1.55	1.80	0.02
Springboard	-0.63	3.70	-0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	4.28	0.79	0.14**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	4.57	1.62	0.11**
University Program for Academic Success	-2.94	1.37	-0.06*
President's Leadership Academy	-3.65	2.40	-0.04
Chapman Learning Community	1.40	1.34	0.02
UNIV 100	0.35	0.54	0.02
BG Effect	0.45	2.09	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.51	1.23	-0.01
Springboard	0.23	0.82	0.01
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	2.57	0.82	0.08**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	5.50	2.63	0.14*
Literacy Serve and Learn	2.05	0.80	0.06*
Springboard	-1.39	0.88	-0.04
UNIV 100	-0.66	0.57	-0.03
University Program for Academic Success	-1.13	1.07	-0.03
BG Effect	0.72	2.06	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.74	1.34	0.01
Chapman Learning Community	0.15	0.87	0.00
President's Leadership Academy	-0.14	2.31	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .22$ ($N = 1{,}002$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .23$ ($N = 1{,}549$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .20$ ($N = 1{,}493$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 46
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.17	2.52	0.14
Honors	4.89	4.38	0.12
Chapman Learning Community	3.44	3.24	0.11
UNIV 100	1.38	2.67	0.06
Springboard	-1.88	10.81	-0.02
BG Effect	2.08	10.69	0.02
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Chapman Learning Community	-5.37	3.64	-0.09
Honors	4.55	4.23	0.07
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.64	1.74	0.06
President's Leadership Academy	-3.08	4.33	-0.06
UNIV 100	-1.21	2.05	-0.04
Springboard	-1.01	3.24	-0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.35	3.99	0.01
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	10.29	3.52	0.20**
Springboard	3.23	3.33	0.09
UNIV 100	-2.56	1.95	-0.09
BG Effect	-7.95	6.66	-0.08
Chapman Learning Community	-1.72	2.47	-0.05
Literacy Serve and Learn	3.02	4.02	0.05
University Program for Academic Success	-2.38	3.98	-0.05
President's Leadership Academy	-0.90	4.17	-0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.60	5.17	-0.01
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.28	2.98	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .28$ ($N = 85$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .31$ ($N = 196$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .28$ ($N = 196$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 47
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Second Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	8.44	0.82	0.35**
UNIV 100	-1.10	0.87	-0.04
BG Effect	0.77	1.60	0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.78	1.91	0.01
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.44	2.80	-0.01
Springboard	1.19	5.23	0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	7.64	0.64	0.31**
President's Leadership Academy	-6.81	2.78	-0.07*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.22	2.17	0.07
BG Effect	-1.88	2.71	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	1.07	1.54	0.02
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.76	1.39	-0.01
UNIV 100	-0.36	0.68	-0.01
Springboard	-0.06	0.96	-0.00
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Honors	4.58	0.67	0.19**
Literacy Serve and Learn	2.87	0.95	0.08**
UNIV 100	-1.82	0.72	-0.07*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.59	3.11	0.05
Chapman Learning Community	0.98	1.00	0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.79	1.64	0.03
Springboard	-1.13	1.05	-0.03
President's Leadership Academy	1.45	2.17	0.02
BG Effect	-0.05	2.27	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .13$ ($N = 811$, $p = .05$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .11$ ($N = 1,354$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort: $R^2 = .07$ ($N = 1,272$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 48
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Third Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	7.60	1.50	0.17**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.62	3.33	0.04
BG Effect	-0.13	2.60	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	1.45	2.05	0.02
UNIV 100	0.61	1.01	0.02
Springboard	1.89	5.78	0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	3.65	1.13	0.09**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	4.77	2.45	0.08
President's Leadership Academy	-4.98	3.58	-0.04
Chapman Learning Community	2.40	2.00	0.03
Springboard	1.32	1.19	0.03
UNIV 100	0.92	0.78	0.03
University Program for Academic Success	-1.60	2.17	-0.02
BG Effect	0.78	3.12	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.95	1.83	-0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .15$ ($N = 933$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .19$ ($N = 1{,}413$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 49

Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Third Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Chapman Learning Community	7.72	4.84	0.19
Honors	5.79	6.13	0.11
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.97	3.74	0.10
BG Effect	-6.68	14.85	-0.05
Springboard	-6.93	15.02	-0.05
UNIV 100	1.70	4.10	0.05
Fall 1998 Cohort			
UNIV 100	-4.15	2.56	-0.11
President's Leadership Academy	-5.83	5.47	-0.09
Chapman Learning Community	-6.30	4.96	-0.08
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.47	2.19	0.07
Springboard	3.55	4.03	0.07
Health Sciences Residential Community	4.60	5.28	0.06
Honors	0.83	4.91	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .23$ ($N = 74$, $p < .05$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .36$ ($N = 168$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 50
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Third Academic Year Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	10.28	1.15	0.31**
UNIV 100	-2.54	1.23	-0.07*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.71	4.07	0.04
BG Effect	2.64	2.26	0.04
Chapman Learning Community	1.20	2.97	0.02
Springboard	2.32	7.41	0.01
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Honors	8.12	0.90	0.25**
Chapman Learning Community	4.78	2.31	0.06*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.61	3.19	0.06
President's Leadership Academy	-4.37	4.19	-0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	-1.35	2.02	-0.02
BG Effect	-1.27	3.94	-0.01
Springboard	-0.37	1.36	-0.01
UNIV 100	-0.07	0.98	-0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .12$ ($N = 770$, $p < .01$).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort: $R^2 = .08$ ($N = 1,274$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 51

Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Race and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Gender

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	6.00	1.91	0.11**
Chapman Learning Community	2.71	2.41	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.41	4.24	0.03
BG Effect	0.61	3.12	0.01
Springboard	2.49	6.86	0.01
UNIV 100	0.37	1.24	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .08$ ($N = 862$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 52

Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and High School GPA and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and Race

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Chapman Learning Community	6.85	5.53	0.15
UNIV 100	4.10	4.80	0.11
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.60	4.41	0.09
BG Effect	-6.98	16.63	-0.05
Springboard	-6.24	16.80	-0.04
Honors	0.06	7.29	0.00

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .31$ ($N = 66$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 53
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting Cumulative Student Credit Hours Earned at the End of the Fourth Academic Year After Controlling for Gender and Race and Examining the Interaction of Program Participation and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1997 Cohort			
Honors	9.67	1.54	0.23**
UNIV 100	-2.98	1.55	-0.07
BG Effect	5.14	2.93	0.06
Chapman Learning Community	3.29	3.60	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	3.23	5.37	0.03
Springboard	3.30	9.22	0.01

Note. Fall 1997 Cohort: $R^2 = .08$ ($N = 714$, $p < .01$).
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 54
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting New Student Transition Questionnaire Scale Scores After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1998 Cohort			
Social Adjustment Scale (α=.80)			
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.85	0.63	0.06
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.76	0.50	0.04
UNIV 100	0.24	0.19	0.03
Chapman Learning Community	0.58	0.49	0.03
Honors	0.29	0.38	0.02
University Program for Academic Success	-0.21	0.39	-0.02
BG Effect	-0.12	0.61	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	0.14	0.96	0.00
Springboard	0.03	0.28	0.00
Academic Adjustment Scale (α=.75)			
University Program for Academic Success	-0.67	0.23	-0.09*
Honors	0.40	0.23	0.05
Chapman Learning Community	-0.38	0.30	-0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.21	0.38	0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.28	0.30	-0.02
President's Leadership Academy	0.37	0.58	0.02
Springboard	-0.04	0.17	-0.01
UNIV 100	-0.06	0.11	-0.01
BG Effect	-0.05	0.37	-0.00
University Involvement Scale (α=.30)			
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.78	0.47	0.10**
Springboard	0.80	0.26	0.08**
UNIV 100	0.51	0.18	0.08**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.75	0.58	-0.06
Chapman Learning Community	0.67	0.46	0.04
Honors	0.46	0.35	0.04
University Program for Academic Success	0.19	0.36	0.02
President's Leadership Academy	0.26	0.90	0.01
BG Effect	-0.04	0.57	-0.00
Satisfaction with Living Arrangements Scale (α=.51)			
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.63	0.44	0.07
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.73	0.35	0.06*
University Program for Academic Success	-0.51	0.27	-0.06
President's Leadership Academy	-1.25	0.66	-0.05
Springboard	0.37	0.19	0.05
BG Effect	0.30	0.46	0.02
UNIV 100	0.11	0.13	0.02
Honors	0.13	0.26	0.01
Chapman Learning Community	-0.02	0.34	-0.00

Satisfaction with Faculty Scale (α=.35)

BG Effect	0.63	0.25	0.07*
University Program for Academic Success	-0.25	0.16	-0.05
UNIV 100	0.12	0.08	0.05
Springboard	0.18	0.12	0.04
Honors	0.14	0.15	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-0.16	0.39	-0.01
Chapman Learning Community	-0.02	0.20	-0.00
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.02	0.20	0.00
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.01	0.26	-0.00

Fall 1999 Cohort

Social Adjustment Scale (α=.81)

Honors	-1.19	0.54	-0.06*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.87	1.05	-0.05
BG Effect	-1.22	0.97	-0.04
Chapman Learning Community	0.36	0.40	0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.68	0.68	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	1.39	1.23	0.03
Springboard	-0.20	0.38	-0.02
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.15	0.42	0.01
University Program for Academic Success	0.07	0.46	0.01
UNIV 100	0.03	0.25	0.00

Academic Adjustment Scale (α=.71)

Springboard	0.67	0.26	0.08*
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.71	0.30	-0.07*
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.94	0.47	-0.06*
BG Effect	1.23	0.68	0.05
UNIV 100	0.27	0.18	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.54	0.74	0.04
University Program for Academic Success	-0.34	0.32	-0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-0.67	0.86	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.11	0.28	-0.01
Honors	0.07	0.38	0.01

University Involvement Scale (α=.36)

UNIV 100	0.37	0.14	0.08**
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.89	0.37	0.07*
President's Leadership Academy	1.32	0.68	0.06
BG Effect	-0.97	0.53	-0.05
Chapman Learning Community	-0.17	0.22	-0.02
Honors	0.31	0.30	0.03
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.26	0.23	0.03
University Program for Academic Success	0.25	0.25	0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.07	0.58	0.01
Springboard	0.03	0.21	0.01

Satisfaction with Living Arrangements Scale (α=.44)

BG Effect	-2.01	0.65	-0.09**
University Program for Academic Success	-0.48	0.24	-0.07*
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.38	0.22	0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.19	0.55	-0.02
President's Leadership Academy	-0.46	0.65	-0.02
UNIV 100	0.08	0.13	0.02
Honors	0.17	0.29	0.02
Springboard	0.07	0.20	0.01
Chapman Learning Community	0.04	0.21	0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.04	0.35	-0.00

Satisfaction with Faculty Scale (α=.39)

Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.59	0.35	-0.10
University Program for Academic Success	-0.40	0.15	-0.09*
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.23	0.22	-0.03
BG Effect	0.20	0.32	0.02
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.08	0.14	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.05	0.13	-0.01
Springboard	0.06	0.13	0.01
UNIV 100	0.02	0.08	0.01
Honors	-0.07	0.18	-0.00
President's Leadership Academy	0.03	0.41	0.00

Academic Involvement Scale (α=.22)

UNIV 100	0.59	0.16	0.10**
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.88	0.27	-0.09**
President's Leadership Academy	-2.05	0.79	-0.08*
Springboard	0.60	0.24	0.07*
Chapman Learning Community	-0.42	0.26	-0.05
Honors	0.58	0.35	0.05
BG Effect	-0.99	0.62	-0.04
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.44	0.43	-0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.32	0.68	0.03
University Program for Academic Success	0.05	0.30	0.00

Fall 2000 Cohort

Social Adjustment Scale (α=.80)

BG Effect	-3.55	1.74	-0.08*
Springboard	0.93	0.58	0.06
Honors	0.71	0.75	0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.83	1.26	-0.04
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.09	1.30	0.03
UNIV 100	-0.29	0.45	-0.02
University Program for Academic Success	-0.41	0.82	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.18	0.85	-0.01
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.37	0.90	0.01
President's Leadership Academy	-0.98	3.56	-0.01

Academic Adjustment Scale (α=.75)

University Program for Academic Success	-1.00	0.44	-0.09*
President's Leadership Academy	4.74	1.92	0.08*
BG Effect	-2.03	0.94	-0.07*
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.82	0.49	-0.06
UNIV 100	0.29	0.24	0.04
Springboard	0.27	0.32	0.03
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.45	0.70	-0.02
Honors	-0.26	0.40	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	0.15	0.46	0.01
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.02	0.68	-0.00

University Involvement Scale (α=.37)

Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-1.10	0.51	-0.13*
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.63	0.52	0.10**
Chapman Learning Community	0.98	0.34	0.09**
Honors	0.57	0.30	0.07
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.40	0.36	0.04
President's Leadership Academy	1.59	1.43	0.04
Springboard	0.25	0.25	0.04
University Program for Academic Success	0.33	0.33	0.04
BG Effect	0.53	0.70	0.02
UNIV 100	0.05	0.18	0.01

Satisfaction with Living Arrangements Scale (α=.48)

University Program for Academic Success	0.58	0.30	0.08*
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.83	0.47	-0.06
Honors	0.20	0.28	0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.23	0.46	0.03
BG Effect	0.40	0.73	0.02
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.19	0.33	-0.02
President's Leadership Academy	0.72	1.29	0.02
UNIV 100	-0.07	0.16	-0.02
Chapman Learning Community	-0.08	0.31	-0.01
Springboard	0.05	0.21	0.01

Satisfaction with Faculty Scale (α=.37)

Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.50	0.36	0.09
Honors	0.42	0.22	0.07
Health Sciences Residential Community	0.69	0.38	0.06
Literacy Serve and Learn	-0.30	0.26	-0.04
Springboard	0.20	0.17	0.04
President's Leadership Academy	0.87	1.03	0.03
BG Effect	0.11	0.50	0.01
Chapman Learning Community	0.05	0.25	0.01
UNIV 100	-0.04	0.13	-0.01
University Program for Academic Success	-0.03	0.24	-0.00

Academic Involvement Scale (α=.21)

BG Effect	-0.81	0.55	-0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.47	0.41	-0.04
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.18	0.40	-0.03
University Program for Academic Success	0.19	0.26	0.03
Chapman Learning Community	-0.17	0.27	-0.02
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.16	0.28	0.02
Springboard	-0.10	0.18	-0.02
UNIV 100	-0.08	0.14	-0.02
Honors	-0.05	0.24	-0.01
President's Leadership Academy	0.08	1.12	0.00

Note. Fall 1998 Cohort, Social Adjustment Scale: R^2 = .02 (N = 1,453, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort, Academic Adjustment Scale: R^2 = .01 (N = 1,453, p > .05).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort, University Involvement Scale: R^2 = .04 (N = 1,453, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort, Satisfaction with Living Arrangements Scale: R^2 = .03 (N = 1,453, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1998 Cohort, Satisfaction with Faculty Scale: R^2 = .01 (N = 1,453, p > .05).

Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Social Adjustment Scale: R^2 = .01 (N = 1,293, p > .05).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Academic Adjustment Scale: R^2 = .04 (N = 1,293, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, University Involvement Scale: R^2 = .04 (N = 1,293, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Satisfaction with Living Arrangements Scale: R^2 = .02 (N = 1,293, p < .05).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Satisfaction with Faculty Scale: R^2 = .01 (N = 1,293, p > .05).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Academic Involvement Scale: R^2 = .04 (N = 1,293, p < .01).

Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Social Adjustment Scale: R^2 = .01 (N = 909, p > .05).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Academic Adjustment Scale: R^2 = .05 (N = 908, p < .01).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, University Involvement Scale: R^2 = .08 (N = 907, p < .01).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Satisfaction with Living Arrangements Scale: R^2 = .05 (N = 892, p < .01).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Satisfaction with Faculty Scale: R^2 = .04 (N = 908, p < .01).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Academic Involvement Scale: R^2 = .02 (N = 908, p > .05).

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 55
Summary of Regression Analysis Predicting National Survey of Student Engagement Benchmark Scale Scores After Controlling for Gender, Race, and High School GPA

Predictor	B	SE	B
Fall 1999 Cohort			
Level of Academic Challenge Scale (α=.67)			
Health Sciences Residential Community	-8.62	3.29	-0.19**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	4.08	3.02	0.19
Honors	2.28	1.26	0.14
President's Leadership Academy	-6.16	3.73	-0.13
Chapman Learning Community	2.29	1.52	0.11
Springboard	1.56	1.63	0.08
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.66	1.09	0.04
BG Effect	-0.69	2.05	-0.02
University Program for Academic Success	0.31	1.68	0.02
UNIV 100	-0.09	0.93	-0.01
Active and Collaborative Learning Scale (α=.64)			
Literacy Serve and Learn	2.05	0.65	0.22**
Chapman Learning Community	2.07	0.91	0.16*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	1.68	1.80	0.13
Health Sciences Residential Community	2.79	1.96	0.10
Springboard	0.91	0.97	0.07
Honors	0.62	0.75	0.06
UNIV 100	-0.34	0.56	-0.05
University Program for Academic Success	-0.33	1.00	-0.03
BG Effect	0.56	1.23	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	0.17	2.22	0.01
Student Interactions with Faculty Members Scale (α=.71)			
Chapman Learning Community	2.61	0.85	0.21**
Honors	1.95	0.70	0.20**
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	2.23	1.69	0.18
UNIV 100	-1.18	0.52	-0.16*
President's Leadership Academy	2.87	2.09	0.10
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.85	0.61	0.09
Health Sciences Residential Community	-1.77	1.84	-0.06
Springboard	0.44	0.91	0.04
BG Effect	0.33	1.15	0.02
University Program for Academic Success	-0.09	0.94	-0.01
Enriching Educational Experiences Scale (α=.50			
Honors	2.47	1.07	0.17*
Health Sciences Residential Community	-5.31	2.80	-0.13
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.04	0.93	0.08
BG Effect	-1.76	1.75	-0.07
UNIV 100	-0.66	0.80	-0.06
Springboard	0.88	1.39	0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.79	2.57	-0.04
President's Leadership Academy	1.47	3.18	0.04
Chapman Learning Community	0.29	1.29	0.02
University Program for Academic Success	0.26	1.43	0.02

Supportive Campus Environment Scale (α=.72)

Health Sciences Residential Community	-5.65	3.09	-0.13
UNIV 100	1.24	0.88	0.11
BG Effect	-2.63	1.93	-0.10
Springboard	1.42	1.53	0.08
Honors	1.09	1.18	0.07
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.06	1.02	0.07
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-1.09	2.84	-0.06
President's Leadership Academy	-2.63	3.50	-0.06
University Program for Academic Success	-0.95	1.58	-0.05
Chapman Learning Community	-0.14	1.43	-0.00

Fall 2000 Cohort

Level of Academic Challenge Scale (α=.69)

Honors	3.60	1.47	0.20*
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-2.87	3.60	-0.11
Springboard	1.60	1.31	0.09
University Program for Academic Success	-1.56	1.68	-0.08
UNIV 100	0.96	0.96	0.07
Chapman Learning Community	-1.04	1.57	-0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.18	1.91	0.04
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.59	1.64	0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-0.69	3.40	-0.02
BG Effect	-0.30	4.05	-0.01

Active and Collaborative Learning Scale (α=.65)

Honors	2.27	0.84	0.23**
Literacy Serve and Learn	2.01	0.94	0.15*
Chapman Learning Community	0.98	0.90	0.08
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.29	1.10	0.08
BG Effect	1.60	2.32	0.05
Springboard	0.49	0.75	0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.59	2.08	-0.04
University Program for Academic Success	-0.41	0.96	-0.03
President's Leadership Academy	-0.48	1.95	-0.02
UNIV 100	0.14	0.60	0.02

Student Interactions with Faculty Members Scale (α=.71)

Honors	1.58	0.75	0.18*
President's Leadership Academy	1.32	1.75	0.06
UNIV 100	0.34	0.51	0.05
Chapman Learning Community	0.48	0.81	0.04
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.31	0.88	0.03
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	-0.36	1.87	-0.03
Springboard	-0.29	0.63	-0.03
BG Effect	-0.21	2.09	-0.01
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.17	0.94	-0.01
University Program for Academic Success	0.07	0.86	0.01

Enriching Educational Experiences Scale (α=.57)

Honors	2.68	1.22	0.18*
Literacy Serve and Learn	1.62	1.37	0.08
President's Leadership Academy	2.39	2.84	0.07
BG Effect	2.58	3.39	0.06
Springboard	0.87	1.10	0.06
Chapman Learning Community	-0.95	1.31	-0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	1.24	1.60	0.05
UNIV 100	0.60	0.81	0.05
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.60	2.99	0.03
University Program for Academic Success	-0.44	1.40	-0.03

Supportive Campus Environment Scale (α=.72)

Honors	2.00	1.19	0.14
UNIV 100	1.20	0.79	0.12
University Program for Academic Success	-1.74	1.37	-0.11
BG Effect	2.52	3.30	0.06
Literacy Serve and Learn	0.87	1.40	0.05
Health Sciences Residential Community	-0.80	1.49	-0.04
President's Leadership Academy	1.41	2.77	0.04
Springboard	0.50	1.07	0.04
Chapman Learning Community	-0.42	1.28	-0.02
Multicultural and Academic Initiatives	0.47	2.92	0.02

Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Level of Academic Challenge Scale: R^2 = .09 (N = 210, p > .05).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Active and Collaborative Learning Scale: R^2 = .13 (N = 210, p < .05).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Student Interactions with Faculty Members Scale: R^2 = .18 (N = 210, p < .01).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Enriching Educational Experiences Scale: R^2 = .11 (N = 210, p < .05).
Note. Fall 1999 Cohort, Supportive Campus Environment Scale: R^2 = .07 (N = 210, p > .05).

Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Level of Academic Challenge Scale: R^2 = .10 (N = 201, p > .05).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Active and Collaborative Learning Scale: R^2 = .10 (N = 202, p > .05).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Student Interactions with Faculty Members Scale: R^2 = .06 (N = 201, p > .05).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Enriching Educational Experiences Scale: R^2 = .11 (N = 204, p < .05).
Note. Fall 2000 Cohort, Supportive Campus Environment Scale: R^2 = .04 (N = 203, p > .05).

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Table 56
Income vs. Expense Analysis for Chapman Learning Community in 2000-2001

Income Gained From Improved Chapman Retention for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
Chapman Retention Rate = 69.8%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 62.5%
Additional Chapman Participants Retained = 10
Additional Income Gained from Improved Chapman Retention (@$10,000) = $100,000

Income Gained From Improved Chapman Retention for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Chapman Retention Rate = 72.4%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 68.3%4
Additional Chapman Participants Retained = 4
Additional Income Gained from Improved Chapman Retention (@$10,000) = $40,000

Income Gained From Improved Chapman Retention for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Chapman Retention Rate = 86.2%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 76.9%
Additional Chapman Participants Retained = 22
Additional Income Gained from Improved Chapman Retention (@$10,000) = $220,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 7
Students Retained at Fourth Year (@70%) = 5
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman (@$10,000) = $50,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 5
Students Retained at Third Year (@72%) = 4
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman (@$10,000) = $40,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 12
Students Retained at Second Year (@86%) = 10
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman (@$10,000) = $100,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman for the First Year for the Fall 2000 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 9
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Chapman (@$10,000) = $90,000

Total Additional Income Gained From Improved Chapman Retention = $360,000
Total Additional Income Gained From Improved Chapman Retention and Recruitment = $640,000
Chapman Expenses = $277,208
Additional Net Income From Chapman Retention = $82,792
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention Only) = 1.3:1
Additional Net Income From Chapman Retention and Recruitment = $362,792
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention and Recruitment) = 2.3:1

Table 57
Income vs. Expense Analysis for the Health Sciences Residential Community in 2000-2001

Income Gained From Improved HSRC Retention for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
HSRC Retention Rate = 75.0%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 68.3%4
Additional HSRC Participants Retained = 5
Additional Income Gained from Improved HSRC Retention (@$10,000) = $50,000

Income Gained From Improved HSRC Retention for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
HSRC Retention Rate = 82.9%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 76.9%
Additional HSRC Participants Retained = 5
Additional Income Gained from Improved HSRC Retention (@$10,000) = $50,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to HSRC for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 4
Students Retained at Third Year (@77%) = 3
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to HSRC (@$10,000) = $30,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to HSRC for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 4
Students Retained at Second Year (@83%) = 3
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to HSRC (@$10,000) = $30,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to HSRC for the First Year for the Fall 2000 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 4
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to HSRC (@$10,000) = $40,000

Total Additional Income Gained From Improved HSRC Retention = $100,000
Total Additional Income Gained From Improved HSRC Retention and Recruitment = $200,000
HSRC Expenses = $43,500
Additional Net Income From HSRC Retention = $56,500
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention Only) = 2.3:1
Additional Net Income From HSRC Retention and Recruitment = $156,500
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention and Recruitment) = 4.6:1

Table 58
Income vs. Expense Analysis for the Honors Program in 2000-2001

Income Gained From Improved Honors Retention for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
Honors Retention Rate = 82.9%
Retention Rate For Students Qualified For But Not Participating in the Honors Program = 76.8%
Additional Honors Participants Retained = 15
Additional Income Gained from Improved Honors Retention (@$10,000) = $150,000

Income Gained From Improved Honors Retention for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Honors Retention Rate = 91.8%
Retention Rate For Students Qualified For But Not Participating in the Honors Program = 84.7%4
Additional Honors Participants Retained = 18
Additional Income Gained from Improved Honors Retention (@$10,000) = $180,000

Income Gained From Improved Honors Retention for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Honors Retention Rate = 90.0%
Retention Rate For Students Qualified For But Not Participating in the Honors Program = 80.0%
Additional Honors Participants Retained = 23
Additional Income Gained from Improved Honors Retention (@$10,000) = $230,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 12
Students Retained at Fourth Year (@83%) = 10
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors (@$10,000) = $100,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 13
Students Retained at Third Year (@92%) = 12
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors (@$10,000) = $120,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 11
Students Retained at Second Year (@90%) = 10
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors (@$10,000) = $100,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors for the First Year for the Fall 2000 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 12
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Honors (@$10,000) = $120,000

Total Additional Income Gained From Improved Honors Retention = $560,000
Total Additional Income Gained From Improved Honors Retention and Recruitment = $1,000,000
Honors Expenses = $233,343
Additional Net Income From Honors Retention = $326,657
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention Only) = 2.4:1
Additional Net Income From Honors Retention and Recruitment = $766,657
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention and Recruitment) = 4.3:1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 59
Income vs. Expense Analysis for The Springboard Program in 2000-2001

Income Gained From Improved Springboard Retention for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
Springboard Retention Rate = 66.7%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 62.5%
Additional Springboard Participants Retained = 1
Additional Income Gained from Improved Springboard Retention (@$10,000) = $10,000

Income Gained From Improved Springboard Retention for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Springboard Retention Rate = 70.4%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 68.3%
Additional Springboard Participants Retained = 6
Additional Income Gained from Improved Springboard Retention (@$10,000) = $60,000

Income Gained From Improved Springboard Retention for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Springboard Retention Rate = 83.6%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 76.9%
Additional Springboard Participants Retained = 19
Additional Income Gained from Improved Springboard Retention (@$10,000) = $190,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 1
Students Retained at Fourth Year (@67%) = 1
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard (@$10,000) = $10,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 14
Students Retained at Third Year (@70%) = 10
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard (@$10,000) = $100,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 14
Students Retained at Second Year (@84%) = 12
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard (@$10,000) = $120,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard for the First Year for the Fall 2000 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 15
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to Springboard (@$10,000) = $150,000

Total Additional Income Gained From Improved Springboard Retention = $260,000
Total Additional Income Gained From Improved Springboard Retention and Recruitment = $640,000
Springboard Expenses = $115,992
Additional Net Income From Springboard Retention = $144,008
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention Only) = 2.2:1
Additional Net Income From Springboard Retention and Recruitment = $524,008
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention and Recruitment) = 5.5:1

Table 60
Income vs. Expense Analysis for UNIV100 in 2000-2001

Income Gained From Improved UNIV100 Retention for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
UNIV100 Retention Rate = 66.0%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 62.5%
Additional UNIV100 Participants Retained = 18
Additional Income Gained from Improved UNIV100 Retention (@$10,000) = $180,000

Income Gained From Improved UNIV100 Retention for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
UNIV100 Retention Rate = 70.8%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 68.3%4
Additional UNIV100 Participants Retained = 17
Additional Income Gained from Improved UNIV100 Retention (@$10,000) = $170,000

Income Gained From Improved UNIV100 Retention for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
UNIV100 Retention Rate = 77.3%
Retention Rate For Students In No Learning Communities = 76.9%
Additional UNIV100 Participants Retained = 3
Additional Income Gained from Improved UNIV100 Retention (@$10,000) = $30,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 for the Fourth Year for the Fall 1997 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 26
Students Retained at Fourth Year (@66%) = 17
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 (@$10,000) = $170,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 for the Third Year for the Fall 1998 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 34
Students Retained at Third Year (@71%) = 24
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 (@$10,000) = $240,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 for the Second Year for the Fall 1999 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 34
Students Retained at Second Year (@77%) = 26
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 (@$10,000) = $260,000

Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 for the First Year for the Fall 2000 Cohort
Additional Students (@5% of Cohort Size) = 34
Additional Income Gained From Increased Recruitment Due to UNIV100 (@$10,000) = $340,000

Total Additional Income Gained From Improved UNIV100 Retention = $380,000
Total Additional Income Gained From Improved UNIV100 Retention and Recruitment = $1,390,000
UNIV100 Expenses (With $50,000 Available To Pay Course Facilitators) = $71,765
UNIV100 Expenses (Without $50,000 for Facilitators as in Earlier Years) = $21,765
Additional Net Income From UNIV100 Retention (With $50,000 Expense) = $308,235
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention Only With $50,000 Expense) = 5.3:1
Additional Net Income From UNIV100 Retention (Without $50,000 Expense) = $358,235
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention Only Without $50,000 Expense) = 17.5:1
Additional Net Income From UNIV100 Retention/Recruitment (With $50,000 Expense) = $1,318,235
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention and Recruitment With $50,000 Expense) = 19.4:1
Additional Net Income From UNIV100 Retention/Recruitment (Without $50,000 Expense) = $1,368,235
Income/Expense Ratio (Retention and Recruitment Without $50,000 Expense) = 63.9:1

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☑ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").